







# THE AMERICAN CATH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

VOL. IX.—OCTOBER, 1884.—No. 36.

---

## ENGLISH AGNOSTIC CONCEITS.

THE latest effort of the skeptics is to evolve a religion in which there shall be no mention of God. An *idea* of God there necessarily must be; but He need not be mentioned, nor believed in. Creation did not require a Creator. Thought and brain were evolved out of themselves. The intelligence which is appreciable in all order and fitness was begotten out of some germ which did *not* hold it. Out of nothing everything comes. Or, at the least, it must be maintained that the infinitely great was a product of the infinitely little. The Idea, God, was the development of an atom. The fact, atom, was an eternal generation. Or, possibly, both an atom and an idea were eternally generated out of energy. Let us leave it alone. The Irrationalists cannot make anything out of it. So we may be excused if we cannot do so. The Irrationalists, however, get well chided. We have many admirable papers in magazines, written by first-class non-Catholic thinkers, in defence of supernatural religion. We have the same kind of advocacy in public speeches. Lord Salisbury went so far a few months ago as to say in a speech upon education that religion ought to be taught in all schools "in the entirety of its supernatural range," and this equally as to dogma and morals. Judge Stephen argued much in the same way in a recent paper in a monthly magazine; and Miss Agnes Lambert, a clever writer, cut to pieces, in the pages of the *Nineteenth Century*, the shameless fallacy of trying to build up a new religion on a basis which was not super-



natural. All grave non-Catholic disputants see the hopelessness of curbing nature by a religion which is *not* above nature. Judge Stephen thinks there might be a moral system evolved out of the purely natural law, which should suffice to control "public morality,"—and in this opinion he is right in some measure—but he is sure that Christian morality requires the *whole* of Christian dogma, and that Christian dogma is, primarily, supernatural. Where these disputants come to the ground, in arguing against naturalists, is in the fact that without authority there is no dogma; and since they reject the teaching Church, they reject living authority, and cannot therefore possess dogma "in its entirety." Judge Stephen, like Lord Salisbury, could not consider this. The "entirety" of dogma was, to them, a dream. The word "entirety" was most excellent in intention; but, in the mouth of non-Catholics, it had no meaning.

To a Catholic, it would seem waste of time to argue that supernatural faith must be built upon supernatural authority. Indeed, the very idea of the supernatural is Divine governance. Just as "a religion" must be primarily supernatural, so the supernatural means God walking with us. But, to take the first point alone,—that "a religion" must be supernatural—all the subtlest skeptics, even Voltaire included, have confessed to the obvious truism. Apart from Christianity, the supernatural in "a religion" has been assumed as its very first postulate. Talleyrand, with just cynicism, told the French Humanitarians, that if they wanted to get their religion believed in, they must themselves, or their apostles, be crucified and be raised again. For how else should they prove their mission to the world? The common sense in such satire is patent. A man starts a new religion, and assures us it is the correct one, and that he has at last hit upon the very thing mankind wants. So admirable a discovery deserves the gratitude of the whole race; but we first ask him for the credentials of his apostleship. His invention may *seem* excellent, but so have about a thousand others; and as we cannot spare the time to wade through all his volumes, to find out the whole merits of his philosophy, we ask him bluntly, "who are you?" "*quis te misit?*" so as to settle the matter off-hand. If he can only reply that he is a highly gifted being, we do not feel that the credentials are sufficient. But perhaps, like Mr. Herbert Spencer, he can show a rare egoism, by the discovery that God is Unknowable; so Unknowable as to require a capital U. This would certainly raise his claim to be listened to. The new art of endowing negatives with the force of supreme positives, by instructing the printer to use capitals,—thus converting such a trite idea as "humanity" into the dignity of the new religion, Humanity; or such a painfully suggestive mood as "agnosticism" into a new science that is simply crushing with a



big A—is undoubtedly the exceptional gift of great apostles who have to fall back on type for their supremacy. Or again, the scholarly coining of grand words, derived from languages almost as dead as the coiner's faith, must present something of the credentials of apostleship.

"Osmosis," and "protoplasm," and "evolution," and "anthropoid" make us pause to bend the knee to the inventors. Such a compound, too, as "brain-waves" sets our common brains wondering as to the sea-like movements of the instrument with which we think. It is true that Professor Ruskin has made merry over this compound, by asking "what does it matter how consciousness is conveyed? The consciousness itself is not a wave." But Mr. Ruskin has no respect for new conceits. "Cellular vibrations" is another way of expressing this same animated behavior of our brains. But to speak of another word which is really very fine: how many men know the meaning of "chlorophyll"? Here again, Mr. Ruskin makes merry. "When I want to know why a leaf is colored, they tell me it is colored by chlorophyll, which at first sounds very interesting; but if they could say plainly that a leaf is colored by a thing called green-leaf, we should see more plainly how far we have got." As to "protoplasm," a word created by Mr. Huxley, there is nothing new in it, save a sound which is ambitious; for a vast number of physiologists had discerned by the microscope the primitive cradle of what we account the human germ. In the same spirit, learned writers, or writers who would seem learned, have treated us to the new word "ozone." We need not feel bashful if we do not know what it means, for Mr. Ruskin—if we may once more quote this keen critic—says *he* does not know; and neither, he believes, does anybody else. But, next, we have the really frightening word "osmosis," which Mr. Darwin was rather proud of having invented. Some inferior minds have said that osmosis means filtration. Perhaps it does. The physicists are still quarrelling over the point. Mr. Herbert Spencer has a preference for "physiological units;" and he is welcome to such additional syllables. "Osmosis," said a satirist some years ago, "is our new Gospel. God—if there be a God, which there is not; man—only he is only an aggregate of cells; human will—but that is only a succession of cellular vibrations—are all Osmosis." We are getting on with our education in "science." Yet, once more, we may quote Mr. Herbert Spencer, who has added this sentence to English literature: "The being called man" (there is a diffidence in this language which makes us nervous as to our own claim to be "called" something which it is just possible we may not be)—"The being called man is a concurrence of atoms, acted upon by a voltaic pile, and emitting sparks of thought." Pyro-

technic, or, shall we say, electric humanity! We are beginning to think we would rather go back to our copy-books. Besides, Mr. Darwin's assurance that men were once apes, who wore off their tails by sitting upon them, gives to us all such a humble beginning that we do not feel we deserve such fine language. "Education," however, may still improve us. And what is education, "scientifically"? Mr. Huxley has told us—and perhaps he believed in what he wrote—"Education is the instruction of the intellect in the laws of nature." That is all. But the laws of nature, if all these gentlemen are trustworthy, must be the most difficult things in the world to be instructed in. Not only are they, many of them, "unknowable," but they require a language, for their very initial comprehension, which might take one a life-time to master.

Yet our new teachers might feel mortified if we attributed to their word-smothering a veiled pretext for disguising their unbelief. They are sometimes careful to tell us that they are believers; though of what sort it is not easy to gather. Mr. Spencer does not wish to be considered a skeptic, that is, of the common vulgar kind. "I have repeatedly and emphatically asserted," he writes, "that our conceptions of Matter and Motion are but symbols of an Unknowable Reality." Here we have a *credo* of much simplicity. "Our conceptions are but symbols." That is, "My conception and your conception are symbolical of some Reality, which, being unknowable, may be called God." We do not seem to approach to any definite apprehension of what such a writer may intend by "I believe." Mr. Huxley is equally ambiguous. When speaking of religion, or religious worship, he recommends that it be "for the most part of the silent sort, at the altar of the Unknown and the Unknowable." This will hardly be a tender or devout worship. "I adore You *because* You cannot be known, and, therefore, I have not the least idea Whom I am adoring," is an odd state of mind for even a Rationalist, who would seem wiser if he did not adore at all. It is not strange that men who hold these ambiguous creeds think it better to get rid of a future world. "The idea of a future world," said an eminent Rationalist, "is the last enemy whom speculative criticism has to oppose, and, if possible, to overcome." This is certainly what some one has called "antitheism." "You may exist, but, if so, you are my enemy," is the genuflectory attitude of these thinkers. They detest even what they account the Unknowable. One claim, however, which is common to all such thinkers, may be profitably considered for one moment, and this is their claim to be "advanced." All these men and their disciples profess that they are "advanced thinkers," and that they are advancing still further and further. Now, to advance means, as a rule, to go forward. At least, we do not



speak of a lessening of human knowledge as being one of the first essentials of true progress; for, if we did, the "irreducible minimum" would be the utmost conceivable progression. Taking the fact that for eighteen centuries Christians have believed in the Incarnation, with all the verities inseparable from that belief, if, in the year 1884, we are to account God unknowable, how can we be said to have "advanced" in religious knowledge? More than this, the grand old Pagans, such superb thinkers as Plato, and the unquestionably "advanced" reasoner, Aristotle, would have thought the language of Mr. Spencer, or of Mr. Huxley, or of their *confrères*, as strangely retrogressive as it was profane. So that, in aspiration, our modern thinkers are as far behind the old Pagans as in actual knowledge they are far behind all the old Christians. It is true to say of Plato that he made the immortality of the soul the very basis of his aspiring philosophy. He even hoped for a revelation from Heaven. He often invoked the Divine help in his reasonings. For him there was but one longing; it was for God. Aristotle, in like manner, though with a less longing spirit, taught that virtue was the first condition of the highest knowledge, and that virtue involved obedience to authority. Our modern thinkers—philosophers!—have "advanced" beyond such babes to the summit of human knowledge, the Unknowable. It has been suggested that the father of the inductive philosophy is not much trusted by Rationalists or by Protestants, because Catholics have made use of his methods. It would, perhaps, be truer to say that the modernists do not trust anyone who believed in anything which *they* could not have evolved. To be "advanced" is to be in the habit of evolving theories which no grave thinker would have hazarded except in play. To bring men back to a crawling and creeping speculativeness, to a groping and burrowing philosophy, to a contentment with the "highest duty" of not being Christian, is the aspiration of the advanced thinkers of the nineteenth century, in the land of the highest civilization.

This last boast of "civilization," in connection with modern thought, cannot possibly be passed over in this notice. Since our advanced thinkers would take away from us all religion, we have a right to look that their new Paganism shall be enjoyable. Give us this world, if you will not allow to us any other! A writer in a leading journal has said that "it would be impossible to reconcile any form of systematic Christian theology with what we (that is, Englishmen) call civilization and progress." We should agree with him. Our civilization is no more Christian than it is Utopian. Starvation and excessive opulence, cruel labor and pagan luxury, contented ignorance and vain agnosticism, are as little known to any system of theology as to any system of natural

virtue or natural decency. Hugh Miller said, speaking of such civilization, that it was probable that, some day, the Radicals of our great cities, who had been robbed of all religious restraints, would avenge on society and on Protestantism the insolent neglect which had degraded them. They have begun to do this already, and in earnest. Radicalism is now revolutionary, just as it is now anti-religious. Radicalism hates "civilization"—hates it justly, and with sound sense and motive—because civilization has meant selfishness and pride, with most anti-Christian contempt for the poor estate.

Civilization, in its modern sense, or as it is approved by modern thought, has come to mean the selfish art of *enjoying* this world's good things by those who are so fortunate as to *possess* them. The number of civilized persons is, therefore, small. The poor can have no civilization. As a matter of fact, the poorer classes in England, especially the poor in country life, have a good deal more *real* civilization than the majority of the rich and the respectable. They live less for themselves, and are more charitable than are the "comfortable," the "respectable," the "fashionable" classes. All their faults are derived from their "superiors." Their virtues are their own work and merit. But necessarily the base coinage of all the conventional proprieties,—as of a false religion, or, as it is funnily called, agnosticism—must corrupt the moral currency of every class of ideas in *all* classes, the lowest as the highest. So long as Protestantism was mainly Christian sentiment, the humbler orders could be "good Christians" in possession of it; but now that Protestantism has given place to cold skepticism, so that half the literature of England is corrupted by it, religious sentiment has come to be thought quite old-fashioned, and a shallow, vain egoism has taken its place. Civilization, therefore, which once *included* Christian sentiment, is now assumed to get on much better without it: that is, civilization in the trite sense of conventionalism *plus* the luxuries which good fortune may assure to us. Free thought has done this. Poverty, which once was honorable, if not agreeable, is now simply disgraceful and contemptible. All classes have caught the infection of this vulgar estimate. Some "good" Christians honor this poor estate—only in prayer books. Society has fallen down before the golden image with such prostration of mind, heart, and soul, that even in churches the poor are suffered to be present, only on condition that they take the least honorable places. Civilization, in its gradual regress with modern thought, has come to be ashamed of magnanimity and chivalry, until it can even say to the poor Christian: "You have no right in our churches, unless *we* graciously concede to you the back benches."



A candid Rationalist has written that "the *idea* of another world is fatal to our making the best of this world." But the *idea* of some modern Christians, taking their flavor from modern thought-ists, is so to blend opposite "philosophies" as to make sure of the present world, and to level religion down to their own meanness. It is this spirit which has so encouraged professed agnostics that they are not afraid to launch their skepticism on the public. If professing Christians did not seem *more* selfish than they are Christian, professing skeptics would try to veil their effrontery. Society, so to speak, pays the skeptics; it gives the patronage which is essential to their success. Take that modern institution, the free press, which is the grand ventilator of all agnostic conceits, and without which very few of us would hear of them. Editors would not dare to publish the advocacy of heathenism, did they not know that most of their readers would enjoy it. No protest reaches their office against such tactics; still less is the "largest circulation" diminished; so, on they go, pandering to the public taste, and the public taste craves for more and more, and grows on the garbage on which it feeds. Without the newspapers agnosticism would make no way. Not one Englishman in a hundred thousand buys a big book on "philosophy"; but most Englishmen read the leaders in the newspapers, which give the currency to every theory or hypothesis. Newspapers are the winds which blow the feathers of human vanity to every nook and corner of the whole land. More than this, journalists usually side with the *talent* much more than with the *merit* of new conceits. If a philosopher, so-called, publishes a brilliant new book, the critics in the newspapers quote the "remarkable passages," whether their tendency be edifying or destructive. A few months ago, Mr. Herbert Spencer, when speculating, in a magazine, as to the possible religion of a future time, wrote many bitter charges against Christianity; and most of the newspapers republished these charges, without one word in abhorrence of such scandal. The "passages were remarkable"; that was enough. Thus newspapers were responsible for spreading skepticism far and wide, *without* the antidote which simple justice would suggest. Ordinary readers (that is, ninety-nine out of every hundred) are not aware that the "philosophers" differ savagely among themselves, though with the decorum of at least verbal politeness. If ordinary readers knew this, they would be often set laughing where now they rub their eyes in mute wonder.

For example: Mr. Huxley has said of his compeer, Mr. Darwin, that his favorite theory is "only hypothesis"; while of the whole Comptist theory, or, as it is usually called, philosophy, he says: "I find there little or nothing of any scientific value." Professor Owen is equally severe on his co-scientists. Not even *one* philos-

opher is accepted by *all*. Mr. Buckle, as to his theory of moral equations,—like Mr. Tyndall, as to his theory of a dynamic principle,—has been taken to pieces by English scientists and English skeptics, with a relish that belongs only to a brotherhood. Yet the affectation of the scientists gives them a charm with the vulgar; and even, to some degree, fascinates the sagacious. Take away this affectation, with the terminology and the capital letters, and nineteen-twentieths of so-called philosophy would shrivel into platitudes, or into theories which were contradicted by common sense.

It would be unjust, however, to pass over one great distinction between the graver and the vainer school of scientists, and it is this: that the graver school is grateful to the Catholic Church for her patronage, if not her parentage, of true science; while the vainer school talks flippantly of the Church “opposing science,” or of being inimical to its independence. Of this last school Mr. Huxley is a chief sinner, affirming that it is “life or death to the Catholic Church to resist the progress of science and civilization.” Such heedless slander has been so frequently confuted by other equally distinguished non-Catholics,—by Mr. Lecky, Mr. Froude, Mr. Hallam, Mr. Laing, Lord Macaulay, and, it may be added, Mr. Tyndall,—that it is not necessary for English Catholics to quote Catholics or “foreign” Protestants in favor of the exactly opposite sense and fact. Monsieur Guizot, though a Calvinist, not only declared, but fully demonstrated, that to the Catholic Church alone Europe owed all its learning and all that is best called civilization. If some English scientists offend so deeply in their insincerity, it is at least due to others to say that, as historians, they are more accurate and trustworthy than as philosophers.

It would be an interesting inquiry, though it would be impossible to give an answer: Do the disciples of these new philosophers believe in the new philosophy as much as do the philosophers themselves? The disciples do not *believe* in it, because they do not understand it; but they *like* it, because it is a pretext for sloth. In England, we hear young men, of from seventeen to twenty five, chattering Huxleyism or Darwinism or Spencerism, with all the easy volubility of complacency, but with serene ignorance of the alphabet of common sense. The *moral* side of agnosticism—supposing that there is one—is easily apprehended by the multitude, because it means simply, “take it easy, since we, your foremost thinkers, can assure you that we know nothing about religion.” Moreover, the new philosophy feeds vanity so agreeably that it must be welcome to every self-loving nature. A man is bid to turn his thoughts inward upon himself; to behold his own teacher in his own brains; to see in himself the only ultimate authority, and in all others the same weak individualism. Thus vanity, like sloth,



is the offspring of that new religion—not inaptly, if ironically, termed *natural* religion—which, having eliminated the Living God out of His Creation, has set up a host of worshipful *egomets* in His stead.

I have said that, without the newspapers, agnosticism would make no way. English agnostic conceits owe their wide popularity to the gentlemen of the press who reproduce them. But more than this, they owe their way to the confidence and the superficiality of the journalists who “write them up” in good English. The funny thing in journalism is that journalists *will know everything*; and will write on religion—on Positivism or on “Popery”—with the easy confidence of profound thinkers and scientists. A gentleman who has just polished off a leader on vaccination, on the Franchise Bill, or on the Derby day, is ready at a moment’s notice to give us his private estimate of the shocking fallacies contained in an Encyclical. He is quite as at home in the domain of Catholic dogma as he was in that of the Health Exhibition; and can tell us all about the “supernatural” with the same perfect familiarity with which, but yesterday, he discoursed on female toilet. Now, this spasmodical journalism is, I should imagine, the chief incentive to the “take it easy”-ness and complacency of the skeptics. If journalists can know everything, so as to *teach* on all subjects, why should not “the intelligent public” be competent to sit in judgment both on the journalists and on the “philosophies” which they handle? If the professed principles of “agnostic” teachers were adopted by all journalists,—which is, to value what is known, not what is speculative,—the occupation of the journalists would be limited when writing about the vagaries of the unknowable. But this would never do; since to be confident about the unknowable is the first credential of an agnostic apologist, as it is also the first privilege of a “free press.” It has often been remarked, that one of the drollest of modern fallacies is the professing to have confidence in a “free press,” when, in reality, a free press means merely “writing up” or “writing down,” so as to please a certain section of opinionists. The press is free, it is true, and so are its readers; but the journalists use their freedom to catch the greatest number of readers, and the readers use their freedom in choosing advocates. Hence, a man, or a youth, with certain hard prejudices, will never look at, still less purchase, any “organ” which he knows beforehand will not favor his predilections. A young man has a fancy for agnosticism (for two reasons, because it sounds very fine, and because he has heard that it excuses him from religion): and he no more dreams of reading a newspaper which might show up agnostic weakness than of reading a newspaper which would recommend him not to smoke. The journalists, who

know exactly the sort of literary pabulum which satisfies the craving of the majority, give full measure of those conceits which are certain to please the masses, and withhold every antidote that might be distasteful. This is the real meaning of a free press; it is an institution designed to put money into the pockets of enterprising speculators in journalism, by whatsoever tactics may best effect that agreeable object, at all costs of spiritual injury to the masses. Agnosticism, as I have said, owes its favor with the multitude to the fact that journalists know it can be *made to pay*; since the vast majority of men and women will jump at every pretext for preferring the present life before the future.

Two other incentives to English agnostic conceits must be noticed in the way of apology. The first is the encouragement which is given to speculativeness by the untenable position of the clergy, who seek to teach dogma without recognizing its source, and to affect authority without fount of jurisdiction. Add to this that *some* dignitaries *preach* skepticism! One example will suffice. A few years ago Professor Jowett, the well-known master of Balliol, and a writer of the famous *Essays and Reviews*, preached a sermon in Westminster Abbey, of which the sole purpose and effect was to establish the two following propositions: first, that modern science has thrown such doubt upon "Miracles" that it is wiser to regard the miracles as exaggerations—as the perfervid impressions of the too imaginative; secondly, that all dogma is but too earnest opinion, and should be relegated to the sphere of false enthusiasm. The morality of the Gospels was, of course, excellent, said the preacher; in short, Christianity should be morality *minus* doctrines, *minus* miracles, *minus* everything which could possibly offend the scientists; and then even agnostics could kindly give it their approbation, and it would be still possible for Christianity to survive. Freethinkers, in England, naturally say in rejoinder: "If this is what you account Christianity, what is the use of priests, churches, or dispensations? *We* can do better without them."

But a second apology for English skeptics is the fact that, in Catholic countries, there is a good deal of professed atheism, and even "antitheism." The latter seems to *them* to arise out of the repugnance with which born Catholics have been brought to regard their teachers. To *us* the explanation is very different; just as to *us* it is a certainty that the whole frame of that disposition which has led to every phase of modern skepticism is solely the result of those "principles" of the Reformation which threw authority to the winds, and enthroned egoism. Still it is impossible to expect ordinary skeptics to work out such truisms for themselves; their education, their habits of thought, do not admit of it.



When they hear first-class Anglican clergymen, and statesmen, and historians, asserting that Catholicity has bred skepticism, and attributing even "antitheism" to "Popish teaching," it is not to be wondered at that, knowing the fatuity of all Protestantism, they look on "the whole thing" as superstition.

So much by way of apology for English skeptics. And yet, once more, let it be added,—for it is affectation to blind one's eyes to the *real* cause of all this hatred of religion,—skepticism is a moral, not a mental disease, and it comes from the general corruption of society. The pace of wealth, the pace of rivalries in business, the pace of pleasures, both equivocal and unjust, the pace of "news" or of succession of sensations, the pace of travel and of telegraphic dispatch, the pace of *suffering* in unnatural struggle for bread, and the pace of *crucity* in leaving others to suffer; the world's pace is simply fatal to that serenity which, *because* it is joyous, is believing. How is it possible that half the world should be believing, when the other half simply uses it for its own selfishness? No poor man would be a skeptic on religious grounds, unless he had first become a skeptic on natural grounds. The unnatural sufferings of English poverty, rendered irritating and souring and demoralizing by the cold neglect and vulgar pride of the prosperous, breed that rancorous discontent which perverts the whole nature, and makes poor men fling up *the religion of the prosperous*. As to the prosperous skeptics, they are skeptical from that sheer laziness which is sympathetic with the oblivion of responsibility. They are skeptical because they are too "busy" to be believing. The business of self-indulgence is far more exacting than is the business of the counting-house or the barrack-yard. It is a business which grants no holiday for reality. The man of pleasure, of fashion, of position, of distinction, finds skepticism the most charming butler to the mansion of his conscience, because he denies entrance to every caller who would trouble him.

Thus the conceits of agnosticism are but the pleasantries of a vanity of which the root was enjoyment of this life. It is a mistake to call skepticism a result of modern thought, save in the sense that it is a result of modern morals. I do not use the word morals with reference to the Commandments, but with reference to natural candor or ingenuousness. And, in this sense, I call it the loosest immorality to jumble words and make their meaning quite valueless by purposely confusing their *true* meaning. Thus, the distinguished author of *Natural Religion*,—whom every one must allow to be a talented if a fanciful writer—jumbles the meanings of common words in such inextricable confusion, that he leaves his readers in utter darkness as to his meaning. "Nature," "man," "God," have always conveyed different ideas, and sug-

gested different facts, to all Englishmen ; and yet the author of *Natural Religion* uses the three words in common, while at the same time making each oppose the other. What can be more fantastic than such an argument as the following : " Nature, according to all systems of Christian theology, is God's ordinance. Whether with science you stop short at nature, or with Christianity believe in a God who is the author of nature, in either case nature is divine, for it is God or the work of God." Which is like arguing, as Miss Agnes Lambert has observed : " A clock is either a man or the work of a man ; therefore, a clock is a man." The same confusion reigns throughout all Mr. Seeley's writings, in spite of his vigorous thought and evident earnestness. He predicates of science, that it rejects God and that it is God ; that it is a religion, even a grand revelation, and yet that it takes the place of Revelation, and that it is even a *new* Revelation of Him whom we call the Eternal, while it dispenses with the Eternal God in all its searchings ; and thus he confuses us with a muddle which might drive us to despair did we not know whence the muddle is begotten. In the same way mere words are made to convey grand ideas, which they have not and could not possibly have conveyed ; and then they are used arbitrarily in their new senses, without apology for thus offending our old habits. Take one example out of many. Mr. Seeley had been arguing that patriotism, or nationality, might sometimes rise to the dignity of a religion. He had previously argued that religion is but admiration ; so that admiration, if devout, was religious worship. In illustration of his meaning he quotes a saying of Mazzini,—forgetting that Mazzini was an unbeliever,—" Italy is a religion." Logically, therefore, it would come to this, that if religion is admiration, and Italy is religion, Italy is proved to be admiration. But of course Admiration requires a capital A, for without it we might think only of some lady's bonnet. This modern trick of using capitals is half the battle with the agnostics, as may be shown by simply leaving out the capitals. You cannot talk of admiration as the same thing with divine worship, nor of humanity as the same thing with divine religion, nor could you exalt nationality, or patriotism, or even energy, into the tremendous dignity which they are now made to enjoy, unless you called in the aid of big type. Even " the unknowable "—wordy deity that it is—would shrink into unseemly proportions if you would not permit to him a big U. And as with words, so with sentences ; unless you threw up clouds of dust, we should hardly believe that some grand truth was behind. Mr. Herbert Spencer, when he is eulogizing his new religion of worshiping (scientifically and philosophically) that august being who is supreme in *not* being knowable, has the fol-



lowing cloud of dust instead of reasoning : " The conception which has been enlarging from the beginning must go on enlarging until, by disappearance of limits, it becomes a consciousness which transcends the forms of distinct thought, though it forever remains a consciousness." This would be an interesting " new gospel " to a poor peasant. A conception gets somehow changed into a consciousness, principally by the disappearance of its limits, and this new birth remains forever undeveloped. A weak mind might get into an asylum over such " religion." Mr. Harrison's assertion that Mr. Spencer's ingenious effort to construct a new religion out of the unknowable " is far more extravagant than to make it out of the equator," seems to be well founded, and not playful. Indeed, the playfulness might seem to rest with the new apostles. There was once an Anglican bishop, of extraordinary reasoning powers, who wrote a pamphlet to prove,—as a mere satire upon false reasoning,—that Napoleon the Great never existed. He seemed almost to prove it, he wrote so gravely. Our modern skeptics take much the same liberty with logic, and often suggest to us that they are " laughing in their sleeves " over the magniloquent verbosity which is " unknowable." Perhaps the half-way men, who try to batter down atheism by weak blows of semi-skeptical naturalism, are quite as objectionable as the professed atheists. Thus, Mr. Harrison's Humanity, whose divinity is in the capital letter, is about as airy a deity as is the Unknowable. Mr. Harrison and Mr. Spencer have different deities ; and each of them is an atheist to the other's god. What is humanity ? No two persons would answer alike. At the utmost the " worship " of it is a sentiment very pretty, and worthy of good stanzas. But what is it ? No human being was ever quite without it, as a natural and an innocent instinct ; but the " worship " is that of beautiful emotion, and has no more to do with faith than with anger. Mr. Justice Stephen, in a good paper on such " conceits," has used these words in regard to the new religion, Positivism, which Mr. Harrison so very highly esteems : " The vast majority of mankind are reproached by the rest for being but nominal Christians, with a lukewarm affection for their nominal creed, and a practical standard of morals and conduct falling far short of its requirements. What will Positivism do with the vast mass of indifferent and worldly people ? It can neither hang them nor damn them. How, then, can it hope to govern them—which, Mr. Harrison tells us, is one of the functions essential to a religion which deserves the name ? " Poor Positivism, like Unknowableism, and like their auxiliary capital letters, and their dust-stirring, impenetrable sophisms, is a wordy puzzle which can no more help the soul of man than a dictionary can satisfy him for dinner.

Mr. Justice Stephen's comparison of all such "philosophy" to "a gigantic soap-bubble, never burst, but always thinner and thinner," is not too severe or contemptuous; nor is Sir Andrew Clark's *moral* charge, that such reasoning "is an unpardonable sin, a juggling with words and ideas, throwing dust into people's eyes, so that controversies that cannot be settled may be stifled." But there is another charge which must be brought against such sophists, and it is the audacity with which *facts* are denied. Just as our new agnostics elevate words into religions, so they relegate facts to oblivion. For example, both Mr. Harrison and Mr. Herbert Spencer coolly assume that theology—as a science which is accepted by the thinking world—is dead, and can never be revived, nor even appealed to as contributory to knowledge. Was there ever a more baseless assumption? As a matter of fact, the *only* science, in the present day, which commands both the heads and the hearts of the thinking world, and which actually *produces*, in millions, those very mental and moral fruits which are the boasted aspiration of our new dreamers, is that Catholic theology which, for eighteen hundred years, has captivated the grandest intellects of the world. What shall we think of new dreamers who, denying its existence, talk of "discovering the foundations of a new religion" (they have not even yet found the spot where they are to dig!), while calmly looking on the completed edifice of the Catholic Church, and saying, "it is not there, it is vanished." A man might almost as well argue in this way: "The sun has got a good deal behind clouds, during the last eighteen centuries—perhaps, for longer. There are times, too, when our England, turning its back on the sun, has to endure what vulgar people call night. It is time, therefore, to discover the foundations of a new sun; and though we have not the remotest idea how to set about it, science—or possibly agnosticism—may assist us in the search, and the sun of the future may be 'knowable.'" Our present sun, as we enjoy it, does very well; and our Catholic theology, as we have it,—and shall continue to have it,—answers all the purposes we can care for. The idea of digging for foundations, which are assumed to exist somewhere, on which to rear a religion which must be imaginary, is really too heavy a task in the world's old age, and we must decline to be engaged on the "public work." "Sir, the world is in its dotage," was the favorite remark of a well-known character in one of our popular English novels; but no such dotage can have come upon it, up to the present time, as to dig for unknown foundations of the unknowable. Looking for the North Pole was supposed to be looking for something that *might*, if it did not, exist; but looking for some spot where there may possibly be some foundation for some religion which can



exist only in words, is beyond even the enterprise of a Livingstone. Are not these "conceits" quite unpardonable? Do we do wrong in indulging a feeling of "modest contempt"—to use the expression of a Catholic deputy in the German parliament—towards humorists who, denying plain facts, try to lead us to worship wordy fancies? And, once more, to deny the *fact* of a supernatural religion, on the ground that science is not itself supernatural, is another "conceit," which is only to be accounted for on the ground of a delirious vanity. The new teachers are pleased to lay down the postulate: "Any supernatural basis for religion is unattainable." It must follow therefrom that all religion is unattainable; unless for religion you substitute natural instinct, and this instinct will lead different people to different ends. What is to be done, then, for a new basis for a new religion? Science, reply our new teachers, must evolve it. But science can only deal with the natural order; and can no more fly up to heaven to fetch down divine truth, than a man can cross the ocean on his wings, or make his voice heard by the inhabitants of the moon. Science is one thing, revelation is another; and to talk of evolving revelation out of science, is like talking of evolving salvation out of arithmetic. *Facts* are what we have to deal with in science; and it is a fact that no science can make religion, as it is a fact that religion does exist without science. How much better to "drop" religion altogether, and to say candidly, "we intend to do without it;" than to say, "there is no true religion, and there never has been, but we intend, by the aid of science, to dig for one." "The essence of religion," says a clever writer, "is to supply to human life something which is not in it. The essence of science is to take the world as it is, and give a clear systematic account of it." This is common sense. But our new teachers are quite without common sense. They cannot see that, as a religion which is supernatural ennobles and renders happy natural life, so a religion which is all quibble about words excites equal contempt for its originators and a miserable dissatisfaction with existence.

Thus, briefly, agnosticism and conceit may be regarded as very much the same thing. A sort of mysticism, or mistification, is the fashion of our time, and it leads clever people to talk a great deal of nonsense. We trace this spirit in other grooves besides religion. Mr. Darwin used to argue that "earth-worms have minds, and that they act *nearly* in the same manner as men would act under similar circumstances." (Perhaps they are digging for a new religion!) And Dr. Nägeli's further assumption, that the province of mind should be conceded to inorganic creation, is only one further step in the same direction; so that some day we may be asked to speak of atoms as possessing some ideas upon

emotion, or of flowers and paving-stones (so often neighbored in our great towns) as engaging in some sort of mutual apprehension. These deep reasoners think so much on possibilities, that they get to have a quick contempt for actual certainties. Religion we regard as our king of certainties; and we cannot but commiserate persons who pass their lives in speculation, when the noon-day sun of Catholic truth would balance their minds.

---

## THE ACADIAN CONFESSORS OF THE FAITH.—1755.

*Acadia. A Lost Chapter in American History.* By Philip H. Smith. Pawling, New York, 1884.

*The History of Acadia*, from its first discovery to its surrender to England by the treaty of Paris. By James Hannay. London, 1880.

*Selections from the Public Documents of the Province of Nova Scotia.* Edited by Thomas B. Akins. Halifax, N. S., 1869.

THERE are martyrs in the diptychs and records of the Church who are honored specially; there are, too, martyrs who, falling together in the same dread persecution, are honored by a general title, with some designation of number, such as that of the Fourteen Crowned Martyrs. So, too, there are Confessors, who, suffering together for the sake of God and his Christ, receive a common veneration.

We do not forestall the decision and judgment of our Holy Mother, the Church, or seek to render public honors to the Acadians who suffered loss of all they possessed, loss of home, loss of family, destitution, misery, contempt, on account of their attachment to their Catholic faith; but we wish to present them in a true light to their fellow Catholics in this land.

But, it may be said, this is a new and strange view to take of a well-known fact of history. Some one will say: "The French Neutrals under the Treaty of Utrecht, in 1712, were allowed to remain in the province, and their course was such as to justify rigor, though undoubtedly it was carried to excess"—Halt! Our Lord, in foretelling to his disciples the persecutions which they were to encounter for His sake, distinctly stated that the persecutors would cover up their cruel work with lies, *mentientes*; and



between the *suppressio veri* and the *assertio falsi* moralists do not find a very broad expanse.

Historians, who ought to make the truth known, have concealed it. No little manhood is required to admit that those with whom you sympathize have been guilty of conduct base, and cruel, and illegal; but the real historian should rise above such meaner things, and tell the truth fearlessly.

The Acadians suffered as Catholics. No other crime is brought home to them. When, in 1750, they sought permission to emigrate from a province where they were already subjected to harsh treatment, the Hon. Edward Cornwallis,<sup>1</sup> Governor of Nova Scotia, wrote them: "We frankly confess, however, that your determination to leave gives us pain. We are well aware of your industry and your temperance, and that you are not addicted to any vice or debauchery. This province is your country; you or your fathers have cultivated it; naturally you ought yourselves to enjoy the fruits of your labor. Such was the design of the King, our master. You know that we have followed his orders. You know that we have done everything to secure to you not only the occupation of your lands, but the ownership of them forever. We have given you also every possible assurance of the enjoyment of your religion, and the free and public exercise of the Roman Catholic Religion."

The Acadians were thus, in 1750, admitted to be the original occupants, industrious, temperate, moral subjects; they were assured that, remaining, they should hold their lands and enjoy their religion undisturbed.

This was said to them as British subjects, for such they were. Whatever their ancestry may have been, the young women of marriageable age, the Evangelines of that day (1755), were daughters of mothers who had themselves been born under the English flag; few of those who submitted to the English in 1712 were then alive; the people were as much British subjects as the Canadians were in 1800.

As British subjects, they were entitled to the rights and immunities belonging to that character; to the enjoyment of life, liberty and property, unless for violation of law they were by judgment of a competent court found liable to forfeit them.

What was the cause of their treatment in 1755? They were required to take an oath, which, as Catholics, they felt to be against their consciences. When, at last, their deputies yielded and offered to take it, as they had no one to consult in regard to it, they were informed that as there was no reason to hope their proposed Compliance proceeded from an honest Mind, and could be esteemed

---

<sup>1</sup> Cornwallis to the deputies. Akins, Nova Scotia Archives, p. 189.

only the Effect of Compulsion and Force, and is contrary to a clause in an Act of Parliament, 1 Geo. II., c. 13, whereby persons who have once refused to Take the Oaths cannot be afterwards permitted to Take them, but are considered as Popish Recusants; therefore they would not now be indulged with such permission."<sup>1</sup>

The Acadians were therefore expressly condemned as Popish Recusants, condemned for their religion, and not on any political ground whatever, still less for any crime against the state, against the peace or against public morals.

This is patent on the documents still extant, which form the only legal proceedings against them, against seven thousand British subjects tried by a Governor and four Councillors, without indictment, present only by delegates summoned.

Anti-Catholic as Mr. Bancroft shows himself in his last edition, he frankly states this: "Guns are no part of your goods," he (Lawrence) continued, "as, by the laws of England, all Roman Catholics are restrained from having arms, and are subject to penalties if arms are found in their houses. It is not the language of British subjects to talk of terms with the crown, or capitulate about their fidelity and allegiance. What excuse can you make for treating this government with such indignity as to expound to them the nature of fidelity? Manifest your obedience by immediately taking the oaths of allegiance in the common form before the Council."

The oath demanded of them was therefore not such an oath of allegiance and fidelity as they had repeatedly taken, but the oath framed in England against Catholics, and which no Catholic could in conscience take, for it was a renunciation of his religion.

The deputies replied that they would do as the generality of the inhabitants should determine; and they merely entreated leave to return home and consult the body of their people. The next day the unhappy men offered to swear allegiance unconditionally; but they were told that by a clause in a British statute, persons who have once refused the oaths cannot be afterward permitted to take them, but are to be considered as Popish Recusants; and as such they were imprisoned.

The chief justice, Belcher, on whose opinion hung the fate of so many hundreds of innocent families, insisted that the French inhabitants were to be looked upon as confirmed "rebels," who had now collectively and without exception become "recusants."<sup>2</sup>

Murdoch, in his *History of Nova Scotia* (ii., p. 282), omits entirely the words "Popish Recusants," and thus misstates the whole position.

<sup>1</sup> Akins, *Nova Scotia Archives*, p. 256. Proceedings of the Council held at the Governor's house, July 4th, 1755.

<sup>2</sup> Bancroft's *United States*, ed. 1883, vol. ii., p. 430.



Hannay, whose "History of Acadia" is one of the most monstrous and barefaced perversions of history that we have ever seen, suppresses this feature of the action of the Governor and Council utterly; his account of the affair can be best stated in the terms he applies to Garneau: "A more flagrant untruth never was told." He suppresses all reference to the act of George I. in regard to Popish Recusants, and once only uses the word "recusants," once only (p. 396) and in a way that most readers would misapprehend.

An oath of allegiance in these terms: "Je promets et jure sincerement en foi de Chretien que je serai entierement fidele et obeirai vraiment sa Majesté le Roy George le Second que je reconnoi pour le Souvrain Seigneur de l'Accadie ou Nouvelle Ecosse. Ainsi Dieu me sert en aide,"<sup>1</sup>—had been taken throughout the province, as Akins shows, though the people asked not to be forced to bear arms against the French.<sup>2</sup>

When the oath was taken, from time to time representations were made to these Acadians, on which they relied, but it was no less a fact that it was an erroneous supposition on the part of the English governors, "that no unconditional oath of allegiance had ever been taken by the people of Acadia to the British crown." The Acadians had repeatedly taken the oath of allegiance.

Hannay, to justify the British authorities, not only suppresses the fact that the Acadians were punished under an English penal law against Catholicity, but endeavors to show that they were guilty of rebellious acts. "With equal hypocrisy," he says, "the French of Minas and Annapolis approached the English governor with honeyed words while they were plotting in secret with the enemies of English power" (p. 389). "It was always observed that any news of French success, or any prospect of French assistance, brought out the Acadians in their true colors as the bitter enemies of English power" (p. 390). "They had given no return of loyalty to the crown or respect to his Majesty's government in the Province. They had discovered a constant disposition to assist his Majesty's enemies and distress his subjects. They had not only furnished the enemy with provisions and ammunition, but had refused to supply the inhabitants or Government with provisions" (pp. 391-2). All these are mere exaggerations of Lawrence's charges, but not a particle of proof is cited or can be cited to sustain them.

Smith, who has examined this subject with an evident wish to consider it fairly and impartially, says (p. 197): "It does not appear that the men thus summarily imprisoned were proven guilty of

<sup>1</sup> Akins, Nova Scotia Archives, p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.*, p. 266-7.

'assisting the King's enemies,' or 'refusing to supply the Government with provisions,' nor even that they were individually charged with the offence; neither did the Council make any but a general accusation of a 'constant disposition to distress' the English subjects, and to 'obstruct the intentions of the King' without deigning to support the charge with a single instance circumstantially proven or even asserted." And he adds: "The question might be asked, where is his authority in regard to their consummate hypocrisy," . . . . or "that the other inhabitants were plotting in secret with the enemies of English power."

In fact, Hannay's charges refute themselves. Not only does he fail to adduce a single particle of evidence to prove them, but had cases existed, the English Government in Nova Scotia had the means and the will to arrest and try any offender. That not a single Acadian had been accused before a civil or military tribunal proves that no evidence existed to justify a single arrest.

Had there been any plausible grounds, Governor Lawrence and his Council would not have raked up an English penal law against Catholics to apply to these Acadians, a law of which they must have been in perfect ignorance, and to which no allusion had ever before been made. Smith, in his careful work, overlooks this, misled apparently by Murdoch and Hannay, as he seems anxious to be just and fair.

Supposing, now, that the English laws against Popish Recusants applied to the inhabitants of the British Colonies—a point which is surely not very certain, and though maintained by a New England Winslow in 1755, would have been gravely questioned by a New England Adams in 1775—we come to consider what recusancy was, and what the penalties for recusancy were.

The recusancy had to be established by indictment and trial. A person could be convicted only "upon indictment at the King's suit or a regular action or information on the statute of 23 Eliz. 1, or an action of debt at the King's suit alone, according to the statute of 35 Eliz. 1."<sup>1</sup> Fines were imposed for recusancy, and if these were not paid the crown was empowered, "by process out of the exchequer, to take, seize and enjoy all the goods, and two parts as well of all the lands, tenements and hereditaments, leases and farms of such offender . . . . leaving the third part only of the same lands, tenements and hereditaments, leases and farms, to and for the maintenance and relief of the same offender, his wife, children and family."

The severe acts of even Queen Elizabeth went no further. There was no provision by which the wife and children were punished for

<sup>1</sup> Cowley's Laws as concerning Jesuits, Seminary Priests, Recusants, etc., and concerning the oaths of supremacy and allegiance, p. 252.



the offence of the father, nor was he deprived of all his lands. And even on conviction of recusancy, new proceedings were required before the crown could occupy the lands. "But as to lands and tenements," says Cowley, "there must first be an office found for the king; for regularly before the finding of such office, lands or tenements cannot be seized into the king's hands."<sup>1</sup> The recusant was regarded as a tenant for life, even of the two-thirds, which went to the heir in remainder. The laws did not confiscate the lands absolutely; and these laws gave no authority whatever to any officer to seize the recusant and his whole family and carry them off.

There was no warrant whatever in English law for proceeding against Popish Recusants in the manner in which Lawrence and his Council did. And if there were individuals who were guilty of overt acts of treason, they had power to punish them, but no law of England authorized the seizure of the property of a whole community and the removal of their persons.

Ignoring entirely the pretext of Popish Recusancy, making charges against the Acadians for which he does not and cannot adduce a particle of evidence, and which from the very nature of the case must be unfounded or the authorities have been imbecile, Hannay has the effrontery to write: "Perhaps those who examine the whole question impartially, in the light of all the facts, will come to the conclusion that it would have been a real cause for shame had the Acadians been permitted longer to misuse the clemency of the government to plot against British power and to obstruct the settlement of the Province by loyal subjects. One statement has been very industriously circulated by French writers with a view to throw odium on the transaction. They say that the Acadians were expelled 'because the greedy English colonists looked upon their fair farms with covetous eyes,' and that the government was influenced by these persons. A more flagrant untruth never was told" (p. 384).

Thus does this writer, who quotes no authorities, pervert the whole question, suppressing the fact that the Acadians were dispossessed of their lands as Popish Recusants; while the plotting against British power, the obstructing of the settlement of the province exists only in imagination. He gives no proof, and could adduce none.

The Acadians, it must be admitted, suffered as Catholics, and suffered for their faith.

Let us, then, come to the story of what they underwent.

Acadia, from its earliest settlement by De Monts, had for a cen-

---

<sup>1</sup> Cowley's Laws, p. 104.

tury been repeatedly taken by the English and lost or restored by them. By the treaty of Utrecht, May 22d, 1713, France finally surrendered to Great Britain "all Nova Scotia or Acadia comprehended within its antient boundaries." This vague description left an undefined territory and a disputed frontier. By the capitulation of Port Royal the Acadians were permitted either to sell their lands and remove from the new English territory, or remain as English subjects, Queen Anne, by a letter of June 22d, 1713, confirming the agreement.<sup>1</sup> The French government urged them to remove to Cape Breton, but there were none to purchase their lands, and no means of conveyance for the people and their property. The English commanders, apparently not wishing the country to be utterly abandoned by an agricultural population before other settlers came, encouraged them to stay, and the Acadians in considerable numbers remained, relying on the assurance in Queen Anne's letter to Governor Francis Nicholson, June 23d, 1713: "We have therefore thought fit hereby to signify our will and pleasure to you, that you permit such of them as have any lands or tenements in the places under our government in Accadie and Newfoundland, that have been or are to be yielded to us, by virtue of the late treaty of peace, and are willing to continue our subjects, to retain and enjoy their said lands and tenements without any molestation, as fully and freely as our other subjects do, or may possess their lands or estates, or sell the same, if they shall rather choose to remove elsewhere."<sup>2</sup> The authorities in England, however, as early as 1720 decided that they ought to be removed, and a proclamation was issued requiring them, within four months, to take an unqualified oath of allegiance or suffer the loss of all their property, and be driven from the colony. They remonstrated and, taking an oath of fidelity, were allowed to remain. They were, however, a constant object of suspicion, and though priests were allowed to officiate for them, these reverend gentlemen found themselves liable to be arrested and deported at any moment. Hannay, with his usual audacity, asserts that the Acadians "were enjoying the fullest and freest exercise of their religion" (pp. 386-7), that they "had been left in full enjoyment of their religion" (p. 393). "They had enjoyed more privileges than English subjects, and had been indulged in the free exercise of their religion" (p. 391). Yet of the twenty priests who were permitted to attend the Catholics at Annapolis, Minas, Chignecto, Pigiguit, from the Treaty of Utrecht to 1755, eight were banished from the province, and four carried off as prisoners at the time of the general seizure of the Acadians.<sup>3</sup> The priests could not, under

<sup>1</sup> Akins, *Nova Scotia Documents*, p. 15.

<sup>2</sup> *Nova Scotia Archives*, p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> They can be traced in Murdoch's *Nova Scotia*, i., pp. 409-484, and in Akins.



penalty of banishment, say Mass at any neighboring station; and in 1724 it was ordered "that no more Mass should be said up the river, and that the Mass-house should be demolished." This is their condition as shown, not by the statements of French or Catholic writers, but by the very documents of the colonial authorities and historians who consulted them. If Mr. Hannay, living under a Catholic government under similar circumstances, would regard himself as enjoying the greatest possible liberty, he truly represents the Acadian question; if not, he is no safe historian.<sup>2</sup>

The charges against the French priests who were on the mission from the Treaty of Utrecht to 1755 are all vague, and in no case were made the basis of any legal proceedings. In fact, the only definite one is that against Desenclaves, that he refused absolution to those who would not pay just debts, and in that way made courts of justice useless.<sup>3</sup>

After the surrender of Port Royal, the inhabitants near it were permitted to remain two years on taking the oath of allegiance, which they did. By the Treaty of Utrecht the subjects of the King of France were to "have liberty to remove themselves within a year to any other place, with all their movable effects. But those who are willing to remain, and to be subject to the King of Great Britain, are to enjoy the free exercise of their religion according to the usage of the Church of Rome, as far as the laws of Great Britain do allow the same"<sup>4</sup>—a contradiction in terms.

The Acadians generally prepared to remove, but depended on French aid and vessels. "They refused the oath and were prevented from leaving the country only by the failure of vessels expected from Cape Breton to take them away."<sup>5</sup>

"But the Queen's letter of 1713 gave the French inhabitants a new offer. All who were willing to become her subjects in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia were free to enjoy the privilege and hold their estates, while those who preferred to leave the country had liberty to sell their properties and depart." The obligation taken by the French in Acadia to do nothing contrary to the welfare of King George I., and the signatures to the oath of allegiance and the obligation are preserved in London to this day, as well as the oath of allegiance and conditions made by the French Roman

<sup>1</sup> Murdoch, i., p. 409.

<sup>2</sup> Akins, p. 124, gives an extract from a "Collection of Orders, Rules or Regulations in relation to the Missionary Romish Priests in His Britannick Majesty's Province of Nova Scotia." Had the Government found it dangerous to allow French priests to officiate in the colony, it might very easily have arranged that priests from Switzerland or Belgium would be received, or French-speaking priests from England, who had no sympathy with the French. Compare Murdoch, i., p. 517.

<sup>3</sup> Smith, p. 123.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.*, p. 116.

<sup>5</sup> Murdoch's Nova Scotia, i., p. 341.

Catholics on the accession of George II. in 1727.<sup>1</sup> "In Governor Phillips's time, in 1730, the unqualified oath of allegiance was taken by all the people (males) on the Annapolis River from 16 to 60." "It is true that some of the subordinate officers accepted qualified oaths from these people on one or two occasions, for doing which they were reproved by the Government." "Some of the English governors discouraged the inhabitants from leaving the country by forbidding their taking their cattle and effects with them, while, on the other hand, the French governors of Quebec and Louisburg showed little desire to assist them to remove into the French dominions." "The French governors did not wish the Acadians to leave Nova Scotia, as they reckoned on them as a check on the British there, as preventing British colonization, and affording facilities for a reconquest. The English governors equally dreaded their removal, believing that if they went to Louisburg or Quebec they would strengthen the enemy's military power. The situation of these poor people, from the conquest to their expulsion in 1755, was much to be pitied, being the puppets of the intrigues and ambition of others, who acted upon their religious and national feelings, and eventually ruined their interests."<sup>2</sup>

Such is the language of Murdoch, a judicious historian of Nova Scotia.

In July, 1720, Governor Phillips wrote to the Secretary of State in England that the French inhabitants seemed yet undetermined about remaining, and he assigns as one reason that they have been told that the promise of freedom of religion is a chimera, and that they would be treated like the Irish and denied their priests.

They might well fear, for no Acadian could hold any office, as to do so he was required to take the horrible and blasphemous oath against the Real Presence, and to conform to the Church of England.<sup>3</sup> Yet with the usual duplicity the English authorities assured the Indians, who repeatedly demanded a definite answer as to the French inhabitants, that "as long as they shall comport themselves with fidelity towards King George, and shall become his subjects, they shall enjoy their own religion and their possessions."

Yet the only privilege allowed them was to choose deputies to wait from time to time on the Governor and Council.

This state of things continued for years, till most of the original settlers at the time of the conquest had died, and a second and even a third generation grew up, born under the British flag and with no claim whatever to be considered French subjects. The number of births among this virtuous people was such that by 1732 the

<sup>1</sup> Archivist Brymner's Report in Rep. Min. of Agriculture, Canada, 1873, p. 156-7.

<sup>2</sup> Murdoch's Nova Scotia, pp. 342-344.

<sup>3</sup> Murdoch, i., p. 363.



French in Acadia had increased fifty per cent.<sup>1</sup> Protestant settlers from New England, Switzerland and Germany were invited, but they did not come; and the growing strength of the Catholics made them an object of fear and hatred. Thus the Council, in 1738, addressing the Governor, gave as one reason of the slow progress of the colony: "The indulgence to the French inhabitants, who, being Roman Catholics, are unqualified to form a house of representatives."

Whenever war began with France or the Indians these people became doubly odious.

Such was the position in 1755, when it was resolved to carry out the long-projected blow against them. They were British subjects who had repeatedly taken the oath of allegiance, many of them born subjects; they could not be convicted of rebellion, or of giving aid and comfort to the enemy. A pretext was needed; and the authorities accordingly resolved to apply the English penal laws against Catholics to the Catholics in Nova Scotia. What those laws were these Catholics certainly did not know; and it is pretty clear that the English authorities did not know or did not care. The Acadians were Catholics, and as such it was resolved to root them out, law or no law. Their deputies were summoned to Annapolis, and they were required to take the *usual* oath of allegiance, and when they demurred, but at last consented, were told that it was no longer possible for them or those they represented to take the oath, as it was "contrary to a clause in an Act of Parliament, 1 Geo. II., c. 13, whereby persons who have once refused to take the Oaths cannot be afterwards permitted to take them, but are considered as Popish Recusants."

Here it is evident that the oath tendered was really that of royal supremacy, involving an abjuration of the Catholic religion, although it is evident that no such oath was ever before tendered; and the Nova Scotia Catholics could have had no suspicion that any such oath was expected to be taken by them.

Now what does the Act of 1 Geo. II., c. 13, authorize or require? It was distinctly the Act under which Lieutenant-Governor Lawrence and the colonial authorities acted, and they could have no power beyond what it conferred. A search in the English Statutes at Large shows no such Act at all; and so far was the government at the time from increasing the penalties against Recusants, that the Irish Statute Book in the first year of George II. (ch. 2) and the third year (ch. 6) shows that the laws were relaxed and the time extended.

There was an Act, 1 George I., c. 13, which required all officers,

---

<sup>1</sup> Murdoch, i., p. 480.

civil and military, and all holding any position in the Church of England, to take, under penalty of losing the office, an oath against the doctrine of transubstantiation and the supremacy of any foreign prelate; but it was intended to keep Catholics from office. It did not require the oath to be taken by all Catholics, and imposed no penalty on them for refusing to take it. There was, in fact, no Act on the Statute Book of England that authorized the Lieutenant-Governor and his officers in Nova Scotia to confiscate the real and personal estates of the Catholics in the province, and none which authorized their seizure and removal to other colonies.

The appeal to the pretended Act of 1 George II., c. 13, is a monstrous fraud, in itself a proof of the malignity and utter want of principle manifest in the whole proceeding. It was determined to rob and banish the Catholics, and dreading that they might take alarm and escape, every means was taken to prevent anything that might induce them to quit the province. Complaints were even made that French officers and clergymen were persuading the inhabitants to leave.<sup>1</sup>

When all was ready a peremptory order was issued to the Catholic inhabitants to send delegates to Annapolis; a military and naval force was gathered, and vessels to carry off the doomed men. It was clear that, oath or no oath, they were to suffer for their religion. The sentence was already passed; all else was a sham and a mockery. Instructions were sent to take special care to seize the priests.

It was decreed that 7000 of these doomed Catholics were to be seized; 500 of the inhabitants of Minas, Piziquid, Cobequid and Rivière du Canard were to be sent to North Carolina; 1000 to Virginia; 2000 to Maryland; 300 from Annapolis river were to be sent to Philadelphia, 200 to New York, 300 to Connecticut and 200 to Boston. The colonies thus selected were not notified that people were thus to be thrown upon them, and no provision was made for their support there.

The nefarious scheme was carried out with secrecy, and troops were collected at the various points with numbers of schooners and sloops to transport them. The Acadians, September 5th, 1755, were then assembled and disarmed, only five hundred escaping to the woods; their cattle were slaughtered for the troops or divided among the few English settlers; then the houses and churches were set on fire, and the Acadian coast was one vast conflagration. The unfortunate people were marched on board the vessels, no regard being paid to ties of kindred or affection. The priests in Acadia, although French subjects, and in that colony under the

---

<sup>1</sup> N. Y. Col. Doc., x., p. 216.



treaty, were also carried off, professedly to be sent to France, but they were really conveyed as prisoners to Boston. They were the Messrs. Chauvreulx, Daudin, Miniac and LeMaire.<sup>1</sup>

Then the vessels started to land the homeless, destitute Catholics, deprived of home and all earthly possessions, at various points. One party of 236, embarked at Port Royal for Carolina, rose on their captors and, seizing the vessel, ran her into St. John's River, where they escaped.<sup>2</sup> The rest reached their several destinations. Massachusetts, instead of 1000, received 2000 of these poor Catholics, and vainly appealed to New Hampshire to receive a portion. That colony, as being on the frontier, declined, although appealed to on grounds of humanity.<sup>3</sup> The brutal Lawrence, who carried out the nefarious work, wrote to Boston to proselytize the children,—"you will the easier have it in your power to make them, as they grow up, good subjects;" meaning Protestants.<sup>4</sup>

At the far south, Georgia had been planted as a refuge for the unfortunate, but it was expressly provided in her charter that no Roman Catholics should be allowed to settle. When, therefore, Governor Reynolds, summoned from holding an Indian council, found 400 Acadians in his limits, he decided that they could not remain, but as winter had set in he distributed them in small parties through the colony. In the spring, by the permission of the Governor, they built a number of rude boats, and in March most of them set out, buoyed up with the hope of being able to work their way along the coast to their former home. With a courage and perseverance almost unexampled, many made their painful way to New York and Massachusetts, aided and encouraged on the way by kind words and kinder deeds.<sup>5</sup>

The 1500 sent to South Carolina were at first apportioned among the parishes, but the authorities there, feeling for their wrongs, offered them vessels at the public charge to transport themselves elsewhere, and many went to France. A few remained in the colony, others sought Louisiana, but many, like those landed in Georgia, tried to reach Acadia.<sup>6</sup> In the South they met some human sympathy; they found the North dead to compassion. When, in August, a party of seventy-eight landed from their bateaux on Long Island, though bearing passports from the governors of South Carolina and Georgia, they were seized by order of Sir Charles Hardy, who distributed them in the most remote and secure parts

<sup>1</sup> N. S. Archives, p. 282.

<sup>2</sup> N. Y. Col. Doc., x., p. 427.

<sup>3</sup> New Hamp. Prov. Papers, vi., pp. 445, 452.

<sup>4</sup> N. E. Gen. Reg., xxx., p. 17; Akins, N. S. Doc., 297.

<sup>5</sup> Stevens, History of Georgia, i., pp. 413-417.

<sup>6</sup> *Ib.*, p. 418. Cooper's Statutes, iv., p. 31.

of the colony, ordering the magistrates to put the adults to labor and to bind out the children, in order to make "the young people useful, good subjects," that is, deprive them of their religion.<sup>1</sup> Fifty-nine Catholic boys and 49 girls were thus distributed in Westchester and Orange. The lot of these poor people was bad enough, yet the next year we find orders to the sheriffs to confine them all in jail, and from Richmond northward this was done. One party of these Catholic sufferers was at this time in some houses near Brooklyn ferry, and an ancient view shows their home.<sup>2</sup>

In July, 1756, seven boats, bearing 90 of these exiles, entered a harbor in the southern part of Massachusetts, and they, too, were seized and scattered, while no terms were deemed harsh enough for the kind-hearted authorities of the Southern States who had befriended them. Conscious guilt exclaimed: "there is no attempt, however cruel and desperate, which might not have been expected from persons exasperated as they must have been by the treatment they had met with."<sup>3</sup>

Those sent to Virginia had a severer lot, but it resulted, finally, in their obtaining a home in France. The Old Dominion seems to have made such positive remonstrance that the English government transported 336 of them to Liverpool, where they were detained for seven years as prisoners of war. Those who know what Americans suffered in English prisons and prison ships during the Revolution, will have some idea of the sufferings of these poor Catholics. A Scotch minister was sent to them to induce them to apostatize and obtain their freedom; the Duke of York made a similar attempt, but though one of them died in prison, they clung to their faith.<sup>4</sup> At the peace they were claimed by France, and reaching that country obtained, in time, lands in Poitou and Berry, where their descendants may still be found.<sup>5</sup>

Those who were cast homeless on the shores of the other provinces, in most cases sought only to reach their own old homes, or some French colony. Without money or resources of any kind, it was impossible for those even in New York and New England to reach Canada, or those in the south to reach Louisiana, through the trackless woods beset with Indians. The colonial authorities would not have permitted it; but they undoubtedly aided many to embark on ships going to the West Indies or Newfoundland; from these points some reached Canada, where they founded the parish of Acadie; others, reaching Louisiana, formed a settlement on the

---

<sup>1</sup> N. Y. Col. Doc., vii., p. 125.

<sup>2</sup> Calendar of N. Y. Hist. MSS., pp. 658-678.

<sup>3</sup> Nova Scotia Archives, pp. 301-304. Board of Trade to Gov. Lawrence.

<sup>4</sup> Brymner's Report on Canadian Archives, 1883, p. 145.

<sup>5</sup> Memoire sur les Acadiens, Niort, 1867.



Teche, where the descendants of these noble confessors of the faith preserve the distinctive traits of their ancestors. We trace them sailing from Philadelphia, Halifax, Carolina and Georgia to St. Domingo and the Leeward Islands, many dying on the way of sickness,<sup>1</sup> and at last we see them arriving in Louisiana, even after that province had passed under Spanish sway, more than five hundred who arrived in 1765 obtaining lands to begin new homes.<sup>2</sup>

The Acadians thrown into New England fared badly at the hands of the bigoted people. They were industrious farmers, and accustomed to sea fisheries, but Massachusetts offered them no lands, no means to become self-supporting. Some, undoubtedly, managed to leave the inhospitable shores, but on January 25th, 1760, a report states that there were then 1017 in Massachusetts and the District of Maine. Williamson, in his *History of Maine*, misled by his miserable bigotry, tells us that "they were still ignorant Catholics," paying unwittingly the highest tribute to the fidelity with which they clung to the faith of their fathers; and certainly the Protestantism which they had encountered, either in Nova Scotia or Massachusetts, had none of the traits of Christianity.<sup>3</sup>

This little body of Catholics seems to have gradually disappeared, most of them probably reaching Canada or the Madawaska settlement in Maine (which is really an Acadian colony), between 1763 and 1776. When a Catholic priest at last opened a modest chapel in Boston, we find nothing to lead us to suppose that he found any Acadians to demand his care.

In the interval we find in New England newspapers proof of the cruel way in which Lawrence and his coadjutors tore families asunder, sending husband and wife, parent and child to far different points. Advertisements appear from time to time in which women and children, cast on the cold charity of New England, implored tidings of husbands and fathers so brutally torn from them.

If Virginia sternly refused to retain those sent to her, and the Carolinas and Georgia so kindly aided others to reach their friends; if Massachusetts, in her stern Puritanism, steeled her heart against the proscribed Catholics, the Acadians who reached Maryland and Pennsylvania were more blessed.

On the 18th of November, 1755, three vessels ascended the Delaware, bearing 454 of these persecuted Catholics, many of them sickly and feeble,—not a few with the hand of death upon

<sup>1</sup> Akins, N. S. Archives, pp. 347, 349, 350.

<sup>2</sup> Gayarré's *Histoire de la Louisiane*, ii., pp. 127-128.

<sup>3</sup> Hutchinson, *History of Massachusetts Bay*, iii., pp. 39-42; i., p. 121; *Collections Maine Historical Society*, vi., p. 379; Williamson, *History of Maine*, ii., p. 311, 318, 349.

them. At once idle fears were excited, lest they should join the Irish and German Catholics and destroy the colony; but pity soon asserted its rights. Anthony Benezet, the philanthropist, did much for their relief, and Father Harding, whose name was always coupled by Pennsylvanians with that of Benezet as a man of unbounded charity to the poor, gave these exiles not only the relief suggested by his kind heart, but the consolations which he, as a minister of God, could impart. At Philadelphia these poor Acadians could approach the sacraments, could hear mass, and receive the ministry of a Catholic priest in their last moments. But the charity could not save these broken-hearted people. More than half died within a short time after their arrival.<sup>1</sup>

Those sent to Maryland seem to have been left in a great measure to do for themselves. Some, doubtless, endeavored to reach Acadia or Canada, or took passage for the West Indies. A number, however, finding themselves in a colony where there were Catholic priests, contentedly set to work to begin the world afresh.

Baltimore, at the time, possessed a half-finished house begun ostentatiously about 1740, by a Mr. Edward Fotterall, from Ireland. It was of brick, with freestone corners, and stood near the present courthouse; its outward appearance is preserved in an ancient view of Baltimore. In this deserted dwelling a number of Acadians established themselves, and ascertaining that there was a priest at Doughoregan manor, fifteen miles from Baltimore, they sent to implore him to extend his ministrations to them. The Rev. Father Ashton responded to their appeal, and mass was for the first time said in Baltimore in a room prepared in Fotterall's building, a temporary altar of the rudest kind being erected each time. The first congregations in the city which, before the close of the century, was to be the seat of a Catholic bishop, and the spiritual capital of the country, were humble enough, numbering only twenty or forty in all, chiefly Acadians, with some few Irish Catholics.

The Acadians who remained, induced by the opportunity of practicing their religion, became chiefly engaged in coasting, and their descendants still remain,<sup>2</sup> and Mr. Piet, the well-known Catholic publisher, can boast of his descent from these sufferers for religion.

Of the seven thousand thus "scattered like leaves by the ruthless winds of autumn from Massachusetts to Georgia, among those who hated their religion, detested their country, derided their

---

<sup>1</sup> Thompson Westcott, *History of Philadelphia*, ch. 193. Walsh's Appeal.

<sup>2</sup> The *Annals of Baltimore* name the Guttro, Blanc, Gould, Dashfield and Berbine families.



manners and mocked their language," few comparatively remained to swell the numbers of the Catholic body. "Landed on these distant shores, those who had once known wealth and plenty were scouted at as vagrants, reduced to beggary, bearing within them broken hearts and lacerated affections, where but few Samaritans were found to bind up their wounded spirits, and pour in the oil and wine of consolation into their aching bosoms."<sup>1</sup>

It is strange that a theme which inspired the muse of Longfellow has not found a Catholic historian to treat it fully. The material is ample, and, as we have seen, it was distinctly and positively a persecution of Catholics for the faith; Providence permitting their oppressors in self-stultification to make it clear and definite in the supreme act, where they appeal to a fictitious law when they were acting against all law, New England aiding with men and vessels to maintain, in 1755, the principle that acts of the English parliament were binding in her American colonies, the very point that twenty years later she so readily gave the blood of her sons to contest.

Mr. Philip H. Smith, who cannot always rise above religious prejudice, or always sift the chaff from the wheat, has, in his *Acadia*, given certainly the best account that has yet appeared of this noble people. On his title-page he gives this quotation from the *Memoirs of the Pennsylvania Historical Society*: "Let those who would persecute or proscribe for opinion's sake, and limit by political exclusion the right to worship God in the form by which he who worships chooses; who would, if let alone, join in the hunt or exile of those who, like the Acadians, cherish the faith of their childhood and ancestors; let them read the story of the Acadian exiles, and beware of the sure retribution of History."

In his pages more truly and fairly than it has hitherto been presented may be read in detail the pathetic story of their seizure and sufferings.

---

<sup>1</sup> Stevens, *History of Georgia*, i., p. 476.

## WHAT ARE THE THINGS THAT IT MOST CONCERNS US TO KNOW?

*Education, Intellectual, Moral and Physical.* By Herbert Spencer. D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1884.

*The Refutation of Atheism.* Works of Orestes A. Brownson, vol. ii. Thorndike Nourse, Detroit, 1883.

*Supernaturalism, Mediæval and Classical.* W. S. Lilly, *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1883.

*The Rights and Duties of Family and State in Regard to Education.* *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, January, 1884.

AN age, replete with intellectual activity like our age, could hardly fail to give birth to a copious literature on the subject of education. Whoever possesses the most rudimentary knowledge of the meaning of the term "education," knows that nearly all burning questions of the day are involved in this problem. The social question, a just source of uneasiness in many States, is linked to it in such manner that its solution entirely depends upon the solution which our age will determine to make for education. And so with other grave issues. The questions of faith, of morality, of religion, and kindred subjects depend upon the fundamental ideas which are being imparted to those who follow after us. Considerable progress, no doubt, has been made in our days towards a more correct apprehension of the absorbing importance of education, and it is due to the more general recognition of this fact that so much has been said and written on this subject, from the ponderous volume down to the unpretentious newspaper article. There appears hardly a number of any contemporaneous serial or periodical publication, monthlies, quarterlies, and the like, which has not an essay or a paper on education. The interest which society displays in acquiring full information on this topic, has stimulated nearly every writer to try his hand at it. This of itself accounts for a considerable diversity of opinion; yet it is quite striking to observe the total absence of uniform and settled notions. Systems, diametrically opposed in principles as well as in application, are urged upon the acceptance of society, and no matter how wild and inconsistent a scheme may be, it is pretty sure of succeeding in securing a respectable following. The tendency of modern writers to replace scholastic precision by a refined indefiniteness, becomes particularly conspicuous in the discussions of the educa-

tional problem. Whether this practice arises from uncertain notions on the part of the authors, and from their limited and superficial acquaintance with the kernel of the whole question, or whether it is due to a desire to avoid the giving of offence, and to a decided disinclination to commit themselves in any way, is quite immaterial. The dry fact remains that the majority of writers eschew clear definite statements, and present, as a rule, their opinions in the dim and uncertain twilight of vague expressions. It is, to be sure, a most convenient mode of disposing of any subject-matter, but the result condemns it. For, the views of society have neither been enlarged nor classified by this practice, but, if any thing, more confused than they were before. Another class of writers, and in this minority are included the ablest intellects, treated, for some reason or other, education under one particular aspect only, and neglected, therefore, to take that broad, comprehensive view which the vast field of education peremptorily demands. Thus, while society has been from all sides deeply impressed with the necessity of realizing the paramount importance of infusing correct ideas and correct knowledge into the rising generation, little progress has been made in revising the compass of what these ideas and what this knowledge should be. And so it has come to pass that our times witness a most unique spectacle. Measures for the instruction of the young have been inaugurated and energetically carried out in various States before those preliminary points were definitely settled on which a universal agreement appears almost indispensable before proceeding from theory and discussion to practice and legislation. Nevertheless, this has been done, as is well known. Nor do we propose to enter upon the ungrateful and entirely unprofitable task of animadverting upon the lack of wisdom and the undue haste which characterize the actions of the various governments, since a lasting amelioration of the present anomalous condition of affairs cannot be expected until correct views are generally adopted and enforced wherever they may take hold. The question arises, therefore, what are the correct views? What is it that education should give to all as the most effective means for the proper discharge of all the duties of life?

The perplexing diversities of opinion as to what the curriculum of education should embrace, and what not, and as to whether it belongs properly to the parent to educate his offspring or to the State, are not removed by the fact that the advocates of all systems are fully agreed upon this, that education should put us in possession of that which it most concerns us to know. The proposition is so self-evident that it is not possible to hold seriously a different view, and forms, of course, the primary element which should be answered first of all. And this is precisely the point on which



the most unsettled and erroneous, because most confused, notions are being entertained. What we propose to do in this paper is to throw a ray of light, no matter how feeble, on this vital problem; and we will endeavor to show that the view which the Church of Rome puts forth in regard to it is the one which is sustained by the ablest exponent of science and of the whole modern school of thought, namely, by Herbert Spencer. Among the materials consulted and used in this paper, his book on education has, therefore, been chosen as a quasi text-book of our remarks, and it may not be amiss to briefly set forth the reasons for this choice. The author is not only acknowledged as a profound thinker, an eminent scholar and a very able reasoner, but he is by far the ablest expounder of modern thought. Neither his integrity of purpose nor the honesty of his search for truth can be called in question, nor, again, his uncommon literary gifts and keenness of observation. Though the volume consists of four different essays, they form, nevertheless, a tolerably complete whole, since they merely treat different divisions of the same subject; besides, they bear no marks of haste, but are evidently written with great care. The book is characterized throughout by clearness of thought, force of reasoning, extent and variety of scholarship, originality of illustration, precision, strength, and beauty of expression. It is, therefore, entirely free from the fault which, as we remarked before, impairs the value of so many modern productions. Herbert Spencer, moreover, is the only one of the whole modern school of thought who has taken time and pains to melt its heterogeneous material into one mass, to think out its principles and to arrange them in their logical connections and systematic relations. His works enable us, therefore, to analyze his system, which is also that of his school, and to reduce it to fundamental propositions which may be clearly apprehended and distinctly stated. Taken all in all, his book forms, in our estimation at least, the most valuable contribution of recent date to the literature of education. For these obvious reasons we are not only not prepared to deal with Herbert Spencer's views in the light and off hand manner in which a professor of a State Normal school, not very long ago, attempted to dispose of them; but we are, on the contrary, quite willing to assign to them the full weight which the transcendent importance of the subject on the one hand, and the unassailable and established standing of the author on the other, impart to them. It will not do to declare Herbert Spencer's views "utterly impracticable" in a summary way, simply because he condemns the public school system of this country, and holds that it is the duty of the parents to educate their children, and that, hence, the less the State interferes, either by restraint or help, with the citizen in the discharge

of this duty, the better it will be in the end for the citizen and the State. Such a sweeping condemnation, particularly when it comes from one who feels himself in duty bound to uphold a system which furnishes him a living, possesses, of course, no weight at all, and is just as unwarranted as it is absurd. However, we are not in the least concerned with the professor of the State Normal school, nor even with Herbert Spencer, save in so far as the latter is connected with the volume wherein he lays down his educational theories.

When we talk of education, we talk by implication of life. For, education is the means of fitting us for life, or, as Herbert Spencer puts it, for "complete living." Education and life are so much intertwined, that in order to discuss fairly and intelligently education, it is absolutely necessary to take cognizance of all facts of life. To pretend to have exhausted education and to ignore at the same time a whole set of facts of life, is one-sidedness, to say the least. It is apparent, therefore, that, as long as religion and religious feeling constitute irresistible facts of life, religion cannot be left out in discussing education. Intellectual, moral, and physical education does, consequently, not complete the course, unless it be taken for granted that religion is included under the heads "moral" and "intellectual." In one sense, Herbert Spencer takes that, indeed, for granted. We contend, however, that he deals throughout only with manifestations of human nature in its strictest, that is, its physical, sense. It is nature and facts of nature, and even psychological facts, as far as they can be explained by physiological phenomena, but never human nature in its entirety, that he is dealing with, except in portions of the first essay, to which we will refer later on. And when he speaks of religion, he himself furnishes us the means not only to explain his silence on this fact of life, but also to declare his system of education incomplete. Before going farther, it seems proper to remark that, as far as that side of life is concerned with the education on which Herbert Spencer dwells in his book, we do not know of a more correct, more convincing, more forcible argumentation. There are not many, and those only minor, points which we cannot endorse without any modification. When he says that, in spite of the stage of civilization which our age boasts of having reached, we are far from having absolutely correct notions on education, far also from knowing the comparative values of different kinds of knowledge, and far from having agreed upon their relative values, we feel that he states the case very truthfully indeed. And because he seems to realize so well how desirable it is to arrive, at last, at a full understanding, it is all the more surprising to see him pass over in silence a whole set of facts of life which, since they are encountered in life, enter legitimately upon the field of education, and these, moreover, a set of facts which

he is far from denying, nay, for the very existence of which he himself adduces the strongest possible proof. In several instances the force of circumstances compels him to leave the sphere of naturalism pure and simple, because true morality presupposes not only that second set of facts of life, but presupposes also a link connecting the two by means of which they are brought into harmonious accord. Yet such is the weakness of human nature that we often practically deny what we admit in all seriousness in theory. In Herbert Spencer's case, we believe his silence to proceed from an honorable reluctance to discuss what lies beyond his own peculiar sphere. Nevertheless, the difficulty which besets the whole agnostic school of thought, namely, the existence of the supernatural, should not taint his discussion of the educational problem, because he recognizes its existence, as will be seen presently, not only as real, but as necessary. And hence the query, how is it possible to set aside in education what cannot be set aside in life? How can the collective experience of the human race from its very existence be ignored in education by a sociologist who refuses to ignore it in life?

The real issue, then, hinges upon this: do Herbert Spencer and the modern school of thought deny the supernatural in life, or do they not deny it? Is the influence exercised by this element under the form of religion admitted by them, or is it not admitted? If they not only admit, but emphatically assert, its existence as real and necessary, then, of course, the system of education they advocate is at once vitiated by their refusal to give the proper place to this agency. Since this is the cardinal point on which many modern thinkers have suffered hopeless shipwreck, it is well worth while to examine more fully into it. For the formation of a valid and correct opinion on Herbert Spencer's own ideas on this subject, it is sufficient to cast a glance at the prospectus of his system of philosophy. He undertook, as is well known, to cast modern thought into a philosophical system, based upon the theory of evolution. The main subject of his inquiry is divided into four parts, namely, the principles of biology, the principles of psychology, the principles of sociology, and the principles of morality. Most of our readers are, no doubt, familiar with his *Data of Ethics*, and hence conversant with the fact that he deals exclusively with natural morality, by defining as good or right and bad or wrong *that* which produces pleasurable or painful sensations. The ultimate criteria of moral or immoral conduct are, therefore, sensations. We make this parenthetical allusion merely to prove that we, by no means, exaggerate in stating that the structure he erected is not a philosophy in the strict sense of the term, but only and solely a philosophy of the natural. How far this can be done, without



doing violence to science even, appears quite plainly from the consideration that he places before the four grand divisions of his system the one subject upon which all these logically rest, as upon their only possible and real basis, namely, the first principles divided into two parts. In the first, which is devoted to discussing the Unknowable, the doctrine put forward by Hamilton and Mansel is carried a step further, and presented in a slightly modified shape, pointing out the various directions in which science leads to the same conclusions, and showing that in this united belief in an Absolute that transcends not only human knowledge, but human conception, lies the only possible reconciliation of science and religion. The second part contains the laws of the Knowable, that is to say, the ultimate principles discernible throughout all manifestations of the Absolute, those highest generalizations which are now being disclosed by science, and which, being severally true, not only of one class of phenomena, but of all classes, form, on this account, the key to all of them.

Now, it is quite certain that a philosophical system, which starts out with asserting that all science tends to confirm the belief in an Absolute far above and beyond nature, is far from denying the supernatural. On the contrary, it affirms the reality of the supernatural. And, if it is true, as Herbert Spencer himself states, that we can have no rational curriculum of education before we settle which things it most concerns us to know, then it is manifestly our duty to ascertain whether it is not important for us, and a matter of vital concern, to know something about that Absolute over and above nature, with which science brings us face to face. Inquiry may show us that this other kind of knowledge, though avowedly not attainable by science, is of equal, nay, perhaps even of greater value than all scientific training; and, until the import of that knowledge is ascertained, it is irrational to affirm that science alone is the all-sufficient *vade mecum* which it is our duty to provide youth with. The powerlessness of science to enlighten us on this point serves simply as an incentive to turn to philosophy, and this department also failing to respond, we would have to turn to religion, perhaps, to gain the desired information. At all events, we have no right to exclude from education a knowledge, until all sources are dried up, from which light on it may be expected.

To do full justice to Herbert Spencer, we quote now in full what he says on the subjects of religion and of the Absolute, in the first essay of the volume on Education: "Doubtless to the superstitions that pass under the name of religion, science is antagonistic, but not to the essential religion which these superstitions hide. Doubtless, too, in much of the science that is current there is a pervading spirit of irreligion, but not in that true science which has

passed beyond the superficial into the profound." And in order to fortify his position, he quotes from Professor Huxley as follows: "True science and true religion are twin-sisters, and the separation of either from the other is sure to prove the death of both. Science prospers exactly in proportion as it is religious, and religion flourishes in exact proportion to the scientific depth and firmness of its basis. The great deeds of philosophers have been less the fruit of their intellect than of the direction of that intellect by an eminently religious tone of mind. Truth has yielded herself rather to their patience, their love, their singleheartedness and their self-denial, than to their logical acumen." And then Herbert Spencer continues: "So far from science being irreligious, as many think, it is the neglect of science that is irreligious. Take a humble simile. Suppose a writer were daily saluted with praises couched in superlative language. Suppose the wisdom, the grandeur, the beauty of his works were the constant topics of the eulogies addressed to him. Suppose those who unceasingly uttered these eulogies on his works were content with looking at the outside of them and had never opened them, much less tried to understand them. What value should be put upon their praises? What should we think of their sincerity? Yet comparing small things to great, such is the conduct of mankind in general, in reference to the Universe and its Cause. Nay, it is worse. Not only do they pass by without study those things which they daily proclaim to be so wonderful; but very frequently they condemn as mere triflers those who give time to the observation of nature—they actually scorn those who show any active interest in these marvels. We repeat, then, that not science, but the neglect of science is irreligious. Devotion to science is a tacit worship—a tacit recognition of worth in the things studied and by implication in their Cause. It is not a mere lip-homage, but a homage expressed in actions—not a mere professed respect, but a respect proved by the sacrifice of time, thought and labor. Nor is it thus only that true science is essentially religious. It is religious, too, inasmuch as it generates a profound respect for, and an implicit faith in, those uniform laws which underlie all things. By accumulated experiences, the man of science acquires a thorough belief in the unchanging relations of phenomena—in the invariable connection of cause and consequence—in the necessity of good or evil results. Instead of the rewards and punishments of traditional belief which men vaguely hope they may gain, or escape, in spite of their disobedience, he finds that there are rewards and punishments in the ordained constitution of things, and that the evil results of disobedience are inevitable. He sees that the laws to which we must submit are not only inexorable, but beneficent. He sees that in virtue of these laws the process of

things is ever toward a higher perfection and greater happiness. Hence, he is constantly led to insist on these laws, and is indignant when men disregard them. And thus does he, by asserting the eternal principles of things and the necessity of conforming to them, prove himself intrinsically religious.

“To all which add the further religious aspect of science, that it alone can give us the true conceptions of ourselves and our relation to the mysteries of existence. At the same time that it shows us all that can be known, it shows us the limits beyond which we can know nothing. Not by dogmatic assertion does it teach the impossibility of comprehending the ultimate cause of things; but it leads us clearly to recognize this impossibility by bringing us in every direction to boundaries we cannot cross. It realizes to us, in a way in which nothing else can, the littleness of human intelligence in the face of that which transcends human intelligence. While towards the traditions and authorities of men its attitude may be proud, before the impenetrable veil which hides the Absolute its attitude is humble—a true pride and a true humility. Only the sincere man of science (and by this title we do not mean the mere calculator of distances, or analyzer of compounds, or labeller of species, but him who through lower truths seeks higher and eventually the highest)—only the genuine man of science, we say, can truly know how utterly beyond, not only human knowledge, but human conception, is the Universal Power of which Nature and Life and Thought are but manifestations.”

This remarkable passage contains several statements which, properly analyzed, yield very valuable information. In the first place, we are told that the limit of what is knowable by observing, studying, classifying and generalizing the facts of nature is drawn by nature itself. And, in the second place, we are assured that the more these incontrovertible facts are investigated, and the more the principles underlying these facts are unearthed, the greater the evidence of the existence of a Universal Power of which nature, life and thought are but manifestations. In other words, Herbert Spencer declares, in his lucid and forcible manner, that no real scientist can deny the existence of the supernatural. Nor does he stop there. He declares, furthermore, that every real scientist is aware of the impossibility of ever learning from the study of nature, that is, from science proper, any truths regarding the character and nature of that Universal Power beyond the mere fact of its existence. We will re-state this point more explicitly still: society is bidden to believe that natural facts, though living and speaking witnesses of their own dependence upon the supernatural, neither can nor do reveal anything concerning that Universal Power far above and beyond nature. They attest, only and solely and in the strongest



manner in which testimony can be given, their own absolute dependence upon that Power of which nature, life and thought are but manifestations. This, as a matter of course, renders the existence of the supernatural, *i.e.*, a power far above and beyond nature, real as well as necessary, for without it these manifestations could not exist. Thus science, according to Herbert Spencer, informs us that the whole creation is ringing out in clear notes and in one accord that the supernatural is not a chimera, nor a superstition, but a fact, a reality, nay more, a necessity. We trust no candid-minded person can draw any other conclusion from the general tenor of the quoted passage than this, that according to the admissions of science there are truths of a higher order than that of nature. Now we ask again in all earnestness, how is it possible to dismiss the knowledge of these truths from education before more is known about them than the little which science can tell us about them?

The whole force of the contents of the passage, given above, appears to better advantage still if the salient points are recast somewhat systematically, and if the situation, as it then presents itself to the mind, is put into the form which the late Dr. Orestes A. Brownson gave to it. Science (the philosophy of the natural proper) has for its object, first, the establishment of the principles of the natural order, so far as they are cognizable by natural reason in their intelligible phase; science is, next, engaged in the elucidation of the relationship of these principles and in the explanation of those facts which these intelligible principles and their relationship govern (for instance, the unity of structure of all sensiferous organs); science, lastly, performs the office of establishing the reality and necessity of a supernatural order, since without it the natural is not only incomplete and absolutely without any purpose and meaning, but altogether not possible. The whole so-called system of philosophy of Herbert Spencer is, as has been observed already, confined to inductions from the observation of the facts of the physical order, and hence limited to the establishment and elucidation of those principles which govern sensible facts, whether of external nature or of the mind itself. The term philosophy is, therefore, strictly speaking, not applicable to his system, except by courtesy, since some of the principles known, or at least knowable by the light of nature, *i.e.*, by natural reason, are, as principles, objects of the intellect and in no case of the senses, and reach, therefore, beyond the sphere of the natural proper into the region of true philosophy. Naturalism excludes thus whatever is not explicable on natural principles, and excludes, consequently, the first as well as the final causes of all things. It stops with secondary causes and sees before and behind only an impenetrable darkness. Valuable as this scientific

knowledge is, and we are very far, indeed, from underrating its inestimable value, nevertheless it does not satisfy human intelligence. For, reason is in man a perpetual aspiration to know the origin and the end, the principles and causes of all things; and since all have their root in the supernatural, it has always proved impossible to prevent thinking, reasoning and reflecting minds from sending longing glances into that darkness and from praying that some ray of celestial light may illumine it. Wherever a race possesses great intellectual vigor, philosophy and speculation are invariable concomitants of this mental activity. This goes to show that the human mind of itself tends to acquire truths of a higher order than the physical.

We proceed now to examine more closely the premises which, according to Herbert Spencer, science establishes beyond dispute. If science forces upon our acceptance—and this an unconditional acceptance—the recognition of the supernatural as real and as necessary by declaring the utter dependency of the natural (nature, life and thought) upon the supernatural (a Universal Power far above and beyond nature), then science certainly teaches the subsistence of a necessary relationship between the two, and this relationship not one of coördination, but of subordination. Again, if science teaches, as it does, that the supernatural, being above and beyond nature, cannot be known, nor comprehended, but merely apprehended by natural reason, then science teaches also that any knowledge of the supernatural beyond the mere fact of its existence can be obtained and is possible only by means of a supernatural help, that is to say, by revelation. Here, then, are two very grave conclusions which flow of necessity from the premises furnished by science; we are taught that, inasmuch as nature, life and thought and all that is, depend upon the supernatural, and inasmuch as the natural is subordinated to the supernatural, the knowledge of the latter precedes in actual and real import that of the former; and we are also taught the necessity of revelation for any knowledge of the supernatural. Nor is this all. From the absolute dependence of the natural upon the supernatural follows also that these two form parts of one homogeneous and indissoluble whole, and have, consequently, not only their points of analogy, but also their points of contact. Real antagonism between the two must, therefore, as Huxley asserts and Herbert Spencer re-asserts, be predicated as impossible, so that the science of the natural can never in any way be out of joint with the science of the supernatural. No collision, indeed, is at all possible.

The services, then, which science renders to humanity on the score of general information consist, according to Herbert Spencer, in this. We know that real science necessitates the assumption,

and certifies with one voice to the existence, of a Great Absolute Cause for all that is, nature, life and thought included. And we know also that without revelation, that is to say, without a supernatural agency, nothing can be learned about this Great Absolute Cause except simply that it is. We know, lastly, that between the two elements, thus furnished by science, a necessary relationship does exist.

Herbert Spencer stops his ratiocination with the affirmation of a Universal Power, which, it is true, he says is far above and beyond nature, and the cause of all nature, life and thought, but which he refuses, nevertheless, to term "God" in the Christian acceptation of that word. As a scientist, he could not go farther. But had he a right to stop there as a philosopher? Did not philosophy lead him on to follow into the furthest recess which natural reason can explore? And if he had continued on, would he have arrived at the personal God of Christianity, as defined by the Church of Rome? These questions are very pertinent.

Philosophy proper (namely, the philosophy of the supernatural circumscribed by the intelligible as far as human reason by its own light can reach, and showing us simply something of the supernatural in the way of first principles and their logical deductions), philosophy, we admit, offers, indeed, matter which it is no child's play to wrestle with, and we feel, for our part, reluctant to express any opinion as to the success which might have attended Herbert Spencer's search in that direction. It seems to us, however, as if, for one so highly gifted as the apostle of the modern school of thought, the road, so successfully travelled over by Dr. Brownson, in our estimate America's greatest philosophical mind, should not prove strewn with insurmountable obstacles for Herbert Spencer. While closely linked to the question of belief and, moreover, to belief in the doctrine of the Catholic Church, this inquiry is still purely philosophical, requires only the keen exercise of human reason and does not enter directly upon the field of religion. For a full proof of the truth that the existence of God is demonstrable by natural reason, we must refer our readers to Dr. Brownson's works, Vol. II. In the refutation of Atheism there is contained that masterly analysis of "thought" by means of which he evolves the formula, first stated by Gioberti, "*ens creat existentias*." It would lead us too far from the object we have in view to give more than a very brief outline of Dr. Brownson's irrefutable argument.

Taking Cousin's analysis of thought, as far as it is just and correct, as a starting point, he discloses in thought three elements, subject, object and their relation, always given simultaneously in one and the same complex fact. Without a thinking subject, thought is, of course, impossible, likewise without an object thought of; and



again, unless a relation between the two exists. This is easily understood. He proceeds then to analyze intuitive thought, and proves that the object presents itself to the subject, thereby obtaining the ontological element. By analyzing the object and disclosing therein three elements again, namely, the ideal, the empirical and their relation, he establishes the objective reality of the ideal. By analyzing this last element and disclosing therein also three elements, the necessary, the contingent and their relation or being, existences and their relation, he is led to the final analysis of the relation between the necessary and the contingent, that is, between being and existences, and obtains the creative act as the only possible relation. This creative act, without which nature, life and thought could have no existence, defines the necessary and real Being as the First and Only Cause from which, *mediante* the creative act, all proceeds. Dr. Brownson further proves how God, as First Cause, establishes the physical laws, and how, as Final Cause, He establishes the moral laws, and how, without the assistance of Revelation, these moral laws cannot be known, so that our ultimate destiny cannot be reached save by supernatural assistance. Dr. Brownson's argument on all these points is irresistible in point of logic, and an altogether faultless masterpiece of reasoning, which carries by its very force conviction. The broad conclusions at which he arrives are foreshadowed, if not entirely corroborated, by what Herbert Spencer leads us to infer from his statements. For, as the ultimate, final result of the search for truth, it will be perceived, that science and philosophy yield almost the identical proposition. The one, Herbert Spencer, the scientist, tells us that there must needs be an Absolute Universal Power far above and beyond nature, of which nature, life and thought are but manifestations; while the other, Dr. Brownson, the philosopher, tells us that necessary and real Being, from which, *mediante* the creative act, all proceed, nature, life and thought included, is God. Now it is, of course, idle to pretend here that the Absolute Universal Power far above and beyond nature is something entirely different from the God asserted by philosophy and believed in by Christianity. It is amusing to observe, however, in what different spirit our age receives one and the same truth, if offered by different parties. The *Syllabus*, which asserts that God's existence is demonstrable by natural reason, was hardly promulgated before it met with adverse criticism, and in some quarters this proposition was with a ready alacrity pronounced untenable, nay, absurd. Philosophy announces precisely the same thing, and no exception at all is taken to it; and when Herbert Spencer formulates the same idea and expresses it in his own way, somewhat less definitely, yet substantially the same, why, the world even applauds. Is not this changeable attitude of

society a forcible illustration of how true the saying is that none are more utterly blind than those who refuse to see?

Now philosophy, by establishing that man, nature, and the whole universe originate in and proceed from the supernatural, *mediante* the creative act of God, compels reason to assert also that the destiny, the end, the completion of the natural, rests likewise in the supernatural. The natural and supernatural are, as Dr. Brownson tersely puts it, two parts of one original plan of creation, and distinguished only as the initial is distinguished from the teleological, for which reason no conflict on philosophical grounds between the two is ever possible.

If true philosophy teaches so much about the supernatural, and if, on the other hand, as sociology admits, life cannot be freed from the supernatural, then education should certainly deeply impress upon our minds the fact, established by philosophy, that our final resting-place is not here below, but that we are destined to return to Him to whose creative act we owe life and thought and existence. It certainly is of very great concern to us to learn that our end lies not in the sphere of the natural, pure and simple, and hence it is evident that a system of education that would fail to give us this important knowledge, obtained through reason by its own light, would fail to give us what it most concerns us to know, and would be, therefore, incomplete. This conclusion as to our final destiny is borne out by abundant evidence of a practical character, if we do not on purpose blind ourselves. It is experienced in the inability of man to be satisfied with any natural, *i.e.*, created good; it is attested by the consciousness of our imperfections, of the limits of human reason, and of our capability to be more than we are by our own unassisted powers. "The aspirations and emotions of soul," as W. S. Lilly so well remarks, "are facts. They may be ignored, but they are still facts. No philosophy can satisfy us which ignores those intuitions, which refers that inner voice of conscience to the action of physical organism, and offers the stone of natural science for the satisfaction of an immortal hunger after living bread." Thus it is quite clear that science, as well as philosophy, contains knowledge with which men must needs be equipped in order to enable them not to grope in the dark, but to perceive in what way they can, and for what end they should strive for complete living.

As it will greatly facilitate the next point which we now proceed to make, if the results of the inquiries made so far are clear and distinct before our mind, we will now summarize the position. Life, since it deals continually with the natural, renders science an indispensable element of education. If correct scientific knowledge can be given to all, by all means let us give it to all. Life deals, moreover, and of necessity also, with the supernatural; and

hence education should embrace correct philosophical knowledge, so that all should know what it behooves them to know in the way of philosophy. These two kinds of knowledge, both the product of unassisted natural reason, are, then, indispensable elements of any rational educational system, and in actual importance the philosophical surpasses the scientific knowledge. Life is still unexhausted, however, and hence the course of what a rational curriculum should embrace is also not yet completed. For, that necessary relationship between the natural and the supernatural which science already asserts, and which philosophy establishes beyond all contradiction, remains still unexamined. Were life circumscribed by nature alone, were science unable to point with certainty to a something beyond the clouds that no science ever will penetrate, were reason, entering upon the highest philosophical search which it can enter upon, unable to define what must be behind the clouds which science cannot pierce, and which, alas, even philosophy is impotent to remove, then, indeed, might education remain confined to the inculcation of science and philosophy. But since science and philosophy, severally and jointly, speak to us of a relationship between the natural and the supernatural, since science and philosophy, severally and jointly, tell us that, save by the interference of the supernatural, we cannot acquire anything beyond the scanty morsels which unassisted human reason, strained to its utmost in both departments, does furnish, we are constrained to ask whether no knowledge has been given to mankind by the supernatural, so as to make that necessary relationship, of the existence of which we know, less vague and uncertain, and to thereby equip us with the means to live up to the fullness of the situation. All we can assert in regard to this third step of knowledge is that, if it exists at all, it is neither the product of science nor the product of philosophy, but due exclusively to revelation. The possibility of a revelation is a point which cannot be gainsaid; for in Herbert Spencer's definition of the supernatural, and likewise in the correct philosophical definition of it, that possibility is fully admitted, nay asserted, as, indeed, the only means for obtaining the third class of knowledge, namely, religious knowledge.

Now, if we consult life to see whether it can give us no clue, no faint outline, as to the contents and character of religious knowledge, we cannot help observing that at all epochs of human history religion in some form or other appears as man's inseparable companion from birth to grave. Again, all religious systems appear, or may at least be looked at, as attempts to satisfy the innate and ineradicable desire of human nature to harmonize the natural and the supernatural, by living up to the requirements of the various religious codes. The citizen of the nineteenth



century, in his culture and refinement, smiles at the cruelty and absurdity of ancient forms of worship and forgets to see below shocking ceremonials a catholicity of the worship of the supernatural, or what was believed, at least, to be supernatural. He also conveniently forgets that he is the fruit of nearly two thousand years of Christian civilization, a religion based entirely upon revelation, direct and indirect. Now, we have seen that a religion, really based upon revelation, is declared by science and by philosophy not an idle dream. And we have also seen that in order to attain to a full knowledge of complete living, and for the completion of the knowledge of the natural (science) and the knowledge of the supernatural as far as obtainable by unassisted human reason (philosophy), revelation is indispensable. This, taken in conjunction with the indisputable evidence of all ages regarding the existence of some religion, serves, if not as a convincing proof, at any rate as a strong presumption in favor of some revelation having been made. We will forego, however, taking this for granted, and examine further as to what religion, from the light we now possess, should be. Religion should fill the void left by science and philosophy. And this void is of a threefold character: first, knowledge in regard to the supernatural, its constitution, nature, character, physiognomy, etc.; secondly, knowledge concerning the necessary relationship between the natural and the supernatural, *i.e.*, our destiny, etc.; lastly, knowledge as to the means for reaching that destiny. This threefold information, given by revelation, must be contained in religion in order to come up to that definition of religion which the premises, furnished by science and philosophy, warrant us to make of it. If such a religion, not of human manufacture, but having for its source only the supernatural proper, *i.e.*, God, does exist, then we are bound to assert that such religious instruction precedes in importance not only scientific training, but also philosophical training. For it is obviously true that, if natural reason, on the part of science and of philosophy, reaches as high as to apprehend the supernatural, and links the natural and supernatural together in an indissoluble union; if experience shows an influence of the supernatural upon life and conduct, so manifest, so potent as to be indisputable; if revealed religion alone can explain what the supernatural is, its laws and its injunctions for complete living, etc.; and if such religion does really exist—it is obviously true, then, we say, that a system of education which not only passes over in silence philosophy, a knowledge that brings us at least a step nearer toward understanding our last end than science, but passes over in silence also religion, the only means of familiarizing us with all the requirements

for complete living does not impart to us what it most concerns us to know, and is consequently radically defective.

We are confident that Herbert Spencer, could he grant that the Absolute Great Power far above and beyond nature had made a revelation, would at once and with great emphasis declare that to know what has been revealed exceeds in importance all other knowledge. From the whole tenor of his writings it is quite evident that his doubts concern only *the fact* of a revelation. The introspection of the forces of nature alone furnishes us scientific truths which corroborate revealed truths; but for this reason they are not in themselves religious truths. That this must be the case, nay, that truths of any kind, in whatever department of knowledge, confirm and must confirm revelation, as has been stated more fully before in this paper, is no ground whatever for mistaking science or philosophy for religion. Herbert Spencer bids, for instance, mankind recognize that the laws of nature to which we must submit are not only inexorable, but beneficial; he preaches, therefore, as far as science alone enables him to preach, that goodness, absolute goodness, forms one characteristic of the absolute which he shrinks from terming God. Again, when he says that the study of nature generates a profound respect and an implicit faith in that which underlies all things, the First Great Cause, he preaches that we should believe in God, and with unmeasured confidence rely upon Him. Here we have two Catholic doctrines corroborated by science; yet what an impassable chasm lies for man between "the inexorable laws of nature are beneficent" and the revealed doctrine, "God is infinitely good, wise, just," etc. When Herbert Spencer emphasizes that not science, but the neglect of science, is irreligious, we fully agree with him; but we add on to it, "and not philosophy, but the neglect of philosophy is irreligious, for our having reason imposes upon us the duty to exercise our reason in the acquisition of *all* that we can know or at least apprehend," and further than that, if there is a revelation, it is irreligious to neglect the acquisition of revealed truths, for all kinds of truths, though of different orders, contain knowledge worth having. Attention to scientific truths alone does not make up for ignorance of philosophical and revealed truths, since science stands below philosophy, and both stand below revealed truths, that is, religion.

For education to be complete three sets of knowledge are thus seen to be necessary: science, philosophy, and religion. Science, namely, the philosophy of the natural, or as we would prefer to call it, the knowledge of the natural; philosophy, namely, the "science" of the supernatural as far as cognizable by natural reason alone; religion, namely, the "science" of the supernatural as far as revealed. What it most concerns us to know is what has been

revealed; next in order come science and philosophy, which can be co-ordinated only under the condition that revelation precedes both, and even then philosophy, in point of rank, stands higher. In all three sets of knowledge it is, of course, the correct knowledge alone which is of value. As the child should be instructed in the true A B C of science, so it is likewise essential that the true and correct fundamental principles of philosophy should be engrafted upon the juvenile mind. And what holds good in this respect of scientific and philosophical knowledge, holds also good in a much higher degree still of religion. It is fatal to the mathematician to let one error, no matter how small, slip into his calculations, because that one little error vitiates the result of his whole magnificent labor. It is fatal to the philosopher to have one single faulty premise in his system, because that faulty premise renders his system and his ultimate conclusions false, and hence worthless. But it is more fatal still for religion to hold alongside of many truths one false doctrine; for this also not only vitiates the result, but misleads the recipient, and eventually by discrediting revelation undermines religion itself. And this brings us to a point which requires some discussion in order to mete out full justice and in unstinted measure to Herbert Spencer, and to the whole modern school of thought. It will explain to us why religion is so often ridiculed, why doubts as to the fact of a revelation having been made are so frequent, and why skepticism is on the increase rather than decrease; it will explain to us also why, in Herbert Spencer's book, religious education is really not even mentioned.

The leaders of the modern school of thought are mostly men of science. These, like Herbert Spencer, while, no doubt, in a general way conversant with the doctrines of Christianity, have not made a specialty of sifting the evidences pro and con as regards the claims of the various so-called Christian denominations to holding the Christian revelation intact and in its fulness. For the most part their views of Christian religion are taken from Protestant theologians, or, perhaps, from isolated portions of the teachings of the Catholic Church. Now Protestantism, in order to make way for grace, demolished nature, and on that account has rendered it difficult for clear-headed reasoners to reconcile the natural and the supernatural. The supernatural, as expounded by most Christian theologians outside of the Catholic Church, appears anomalous, illogical, and arbitrary, if not absurd. Unless the cardinal unity of the two orders and their true relationship is thoroughly understood, theology kills science as well as religion, and doing this, the scientists, of course, no longer admit revelation. Even within the pale of the Catholic Church, theology has mostly been studied in separate questions and articles of detail, rather than as one uniform and indissolu-



ble whole. Seldom, indeed, do we find any one looking below a dogma to the Catholic, that is to say, the universal principle that underlies and governs it, that binds it to every other dogma, and integrates it in the living unity of the divine purpose of creation. Religion has been presented in articles of faith, assorted, dissected, labelled, accurately described and analyzed, but rarely as one grand whole, consisting of several integral and inseparable parts. Scientists often cannot help mocking at theological assertions which stand flatly contradicted by science, and are far from presenting in any way the true Catholic revelation, for they know very well that true religion can never teach what does violence to established natural facts. True religion can and does assert that the One who made the inexorable laws of nature has the power to suspend them at will, which is a proposition to which science cannot take exception. But we cannot be told by religion that the Supreme Lawgiver made two sets of laws, one of which excludes the other.

Is it much to be wondered at that Christianity loses caste among men of culture when almost daily the spectacle can be witnessed of one Protestant minister exposing in the pulpit the untenability and weakness of another Protestant minister's position? Is it not true that outside of the Church of Rome Christianity is disintegrating, and that at a rapid rate? Does it not occur even in the most conservative Protestant denomination, namely, the Episcopal Church, that conventions for the election of bishops are turned, by High Church and Low Church factions, into meetings bearing a strong resemblance to political conventions, with caucuses and all other appendages? It is a state of affairs for which the Church of Rome is in no way to blame, yet the Episcopal Church is confessedly a Christian Church, and for that reason is Christianity held responsible for it. Protestantism is the fruitful source, and must shoulder the paternity of much of the existing unbelief. But, while this is all true, it is only an explanation, but no valid excuse, for discrediting religion, revelation, and Christianity. As long as there is one Church whose doctrines are in full accord with true science and true philosophy,—a Church which, from the first day of its existence down through centuries and centuries, has held and taught the self-same, identical truth,—a Church, moreover, which lays claim to infallibility—a claim that might well be expected where true revelation is deposited—as long as this Church, well known as the Roman Catholic Church, continues on, unaffected by what is and has been going on all around, true religion should be searched for in that Church. There and nowhere else can it be found.

Herbert Spencer's silence on religion, then, originating, as we believe it does, in uncertainty, honest doubt, sincere bewilderment,

can be well accounted for. But it hardly exonerates him from omitting to state more definitely than he has done, what philosophy can disclose; and what these ultimate philosophical truths, in conjunction with what science leads us to infer, and what experience forces us to recognize, teach us in regard to the nature of religious knowledge, and the important part this highest knowledge plays in life, and hence necessarily in education. If unable to say more, the sincere honesty, characteristic of all his works, should have prompted him to say, "Leave not out religious instruction in bringing up children, if true religion, not a fabric of man, but revealed by the supernatural, has an abode here below; I for my part confess that I did not discover it." This attitude Herbert Spencer would, no doubt, have assumed, had he not neglected to touch upon the philosophical side of education. And had he seen more, did he know more of Catholicity, it seems to us as if he would have enjoined what that Church enjoins. As it is, he avoided, in the volume on Education as carefully as in all his other works, to tread upon any save strictly scientific ground. His philosophy, which, as has been shown, is merely a philosophical systematizing of the truths of the natural order as given by science, is, however, pervaded, no less than his educational theory, by a consciousness, felt, rather than expressed, that a higher order of truths should crown and confirm scientific truths; and that not until these have received a ratification are they entirely removed from the sphere of doubt.

The various inquiries which we have made compel us thus to recognize that no educational system is complete which does not furnish three kinds of knowledge—scientific, philosophical, and religious—for these alone exhaust the fulness of life. In regard to the comparative value of these three indispensable elements of equipping us for complete living, the order in which they have been named and investigated must be reversed, and the first and highest place be assigned to religion as the means of reaching our destiny, no matter how unscientific and how unphilosophical our culture otherwise may be.

If we reflect that, of the great mass of human beings which populate our globe, the vast majority always must remain contented with a crude and fragmentary knowledge of science and philosophy, religion is at once brought out in bold relief. No matter how far we may advance, the hedger and the ditcher, and the cart-driver and the bricklayer will always ply their humble vocations. Neither they nor the large class of laborers whom agriculture and commerce and industry press into service, and who toil for their daily bread, ever can or will attain to that height of culture, to that ideal summit of education, where science and philosophy and religion are all found enthroned. Even the student,

the scholar, the scientist, and the theologian generally follow one line only, and acquire prominence, as a rule, in that alone. Nature itself displays an aristocratic tendency in the distribution of intellectual gifts, so much so that it is quite certain that not all men, nor the majority, could climb to the same height of knowledge, even if the circumstances of life could be so altered as to place precisely the same possibilities within the reach of all. This consideration of itself convinces us that an educational system which is not universally applicable, because it aims at an impossibility, is hardly of great practical value. At all times it will remain true that only the small, nay, an altogether insignificant fraction of the world's population, can be converted into scientists, scholars, philosophers, and theologians.

Yet, shall we, because of the impossibility of ever making a common good of scientific and philosophical knowledge, conclude that the vast majority of all ages is forever hopelessly excluded from complete living and from reaching the end of man's existence? No, we are fortunately spared from drawing so cruel a conclusion, because, what science and what philosophy prove powerless to do, all that and much more religion can and does do. Our natural inclinations and desires, our ambitions and our longings will forever fiercely battle against the circumstances which on every side hem these in, be they great or small. Nor does the knowledge of the disastrous consequences attending with absolute certainty on the violation of an immutable law of nature, prove more than a fragile safeguard for those even who rank foremost in culture and refinement. Neither science nor philosophy can ever be turned into effective checks for curbing our appetites, subduing our passions, and resigning ourselves contentedly to the part which it is ours to play. A more efficient means within the reach of all, and required by all, by the learned few and by the unlearned many, is therefore necessary, and is found and exists only in true religion. True religion alone furnishes us the means of rendering us in any and all walks of life capable of complete living, by making and insisting upon our living up to those grand truths which only a God could bring down on earth, and leave here below forever as a perennial blessing for all humanity. So far, then, from being an element that may or can be eliminated from education, true religion is, on the contrary, the one thing needful above all. That instruction can be imparted to all, while all other knowledge, however desirable it is, cannot be imparted to all.

If the whole human race were well grounded in, and lived up to the teachings of Christ's true Church, labor would then lose its sting of hardship, the social troubles be allayed, science and philosophy flourish with new and resplendent vigor, the arts of peace



replace the terrors of war; there would then be rendered to God that worship of thought and word and action which alone lifts the veil of the future, and shows in the distance the blissful enjoyment of eternity as the fruition of a well-lived life.

---

## THE RELIGIOUS STATE.

*The Religious State.* A digest of the doctrine of Suarez contained in his treatise "De Statu Religionis." By William Humphrey, Priest of the Society of Jesus. London: Burns & Oates. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co., 1884.

ONE of the distinctive characteristics of the Church of God is her sanctity. In her doctrine, in the lives of many of her children, in her institutions and preaching, this sanctity appears; it is also found in her sacraments and in the means which she takes to curb human passion and to promote divine worship. Holiness is of the essence of the Church, and is not corrupted by the treachery of some of her members, nor by the scandals of others, neither does it fail amid the fury of persecution nor amid the deceits of heresy. In the midst of dangers of every kind, her strength lies in the consciousness of the sanctity with which she has been divinely endowed. The Church of God, then, as such, needs no reform; in the essential qualities of her life she is always the same, stemming the tide of human passion and bearing in her bosom, for the good of souls, the promises, the graces, and the merits of her Divine Founder. Possessing the seeds of supernatural truth and of holiness, and fertilized as the Lord's vineyard by the dew and breath of heaven, she necessarily manifests her divine life, in some phase or other, and according to some degree or other. Within her boundaries also grow, apart, the germs of certain forms of virtuous living, and these germs again are trained by reverential hands into different shapes and for different purposes, but the life that is in them all is from the same divine source, and the power wherewith they grow is the same.

As a living divinely constituted body the Church exists with the Holy Spirit always abiding in her to lead her into all truth, with her sacred sacramental system as the great channel of divine grace, and with her divinely organized hierarchy as her governing

authority. The inner life of that Church, her soul, is made up, so to say, principally of the divine virtues of faith, hope, and charity; while the law of their growth is, with God's grace, the observance of the precepts and counsels which Christ has given to men. In his divine wisdom and mercifulness, He has not laid under commandment all human actions, He has not exacted of men all that men can give, but has left to them a large part of the conduct of life which they may dispose of, within the limits of the lawful, according to their generosity.

His commandments from their very nature bind the human conscience, His counsels are left to the free choice of men. The subject matter of the commandments is good, that of the counsels superadded to the former is better. It is laudable to hear Mass on Sundays, but together with that, to hear Mass also on weekdays is much more so. The commandments are for all, the counsels are for the comparatively few. "Of virginity it has been said," writes St. Augustine, "'he that can take, let him take it;' of justice it has not been said, he who can do it, let him do it, but, every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit shall be cut down and shall be cast into the fire." The observance of the commandments brings with it a reward, and the violation of them a punishment, but the non-observance of the counsels by themselves entails no penalty, while the fulfilment of them gains God's special favor. To the divine precepts they are appended, as it were, as motives for the practice of higher virtue, or as tests of the devotedness of generous hearts, though in the eyes of the world they are deceit and foolishness and cruelty. Of the counsels the principal are voluntary poverty, chastity, and obedience, or the evangelical counsels, as they are called.

In Holy Scripture, and we here speak only of the New Testament, the aforesaid counsels are distinctly specified by Christ and by the Apostles. In the nineteenth chapter of the Gospel of St. Matthew our Lord distinctly contrasts the counsels with the commandments, and makes them the conditions of a new calling. The observance of the commandments, He teaches, will lead to eternal life,—“if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments,”—whereas the observance of the counsels, as conferring perfection, will merit not only eternal life but also “treasures in heaven.” “If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell what thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and, come, follow me.” In the one case, a proof of divine charity is given by the fulfilling of the law; in the other case, a greater proof still of that charity is shown by the doing, from a generous will, of that which is above and beyond the law. In both instances the greater or less perfection of the Christian soul is essentially

derived from the greater or less degree of charity; it is it which unites the soul to God, its last end, which gives supernatural merit to human actions, and which tempers, as it were, all other virtues with its heavenly elevating character. "Charity is the bond of perfection;" "the end of the commandment;" "God is charity," and, "he that abideth in charity abideth in God, and God in him." Even from a natural standpoint, the love of God is, for man, a dictate of nature, springing from gratitude for the benefits which he has received by creation; but in the supernatural order that love elevated by grace and aspiring to the beatific vision is also a special precept. Having in view this disposition of the divine dispensations, St. Thomas teaches that "perfection essentially consists in the observance of the commandments," "but secondarily and instrumentally in the observance of the counsels." He who sins grievously against the commandment forfeits charity, but he who, apart from the obligations of a vow, does not observe a counsel, shows only a want of generosity towards his Maker.

Charity, however, among men, is of different degrees; there is a charity,—the lowest indeed in degree,—whose test is the fulfilment of the commandments, and whose possession is necessary for salvation. He who is not in mortal sin has this charity, and, on the other hand, "he that loveth not, abideth in death." A higher degree of charity is that which consists not only in avoiding mortal sin, but also venial faults and those obstacles which stand in the way of the soul's aiming at greater intimacy with God. In this last grade of divine love, one will be imperfect, of course, when compared with the blessed in heaven, but perfect compared with others whose charity is in a lower degree. The young man spoken of in the Gospel, by keeping the commandments, was within the bounds of God's friendship; he had charity and the perfection which it denotes; but that perfection of which theologians generally speak, which, untrammelled by earthly goods, aims in the spirit of charity at higher virtues,—that perfection he had not. It was it which was offered to him by our Lord, and which he had not the courage to embrace. The substance of perfection, therefore, he possessed, but the instruments for gaining a higher degree of it he refused. In more general terms, on other occasions, Christ recommended perfection to his followers, leaving it to themselves to discriminate between what is of precept and what is of counsel. In this connection it was that He said: "Be ye perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect."

Again, in the same nineteenth chapter of St. Matthew's gospel, Christ also recommended the counsel of chastity. In answer to a wily question put to Him by the Jews, He upheld and enforced the indissolubility of the marriage-tie, affirming that the privilege



of divorce granted by Moses was wrung from him by Jewish perversity. But under the New Law He ruled that not even for adultery may divorce be granted. Afterwards, when questioned by his disciples on the expediency in such circumstances of getting married at all, He does not command an unmarried life, but leaves it to the gracious ways of Providence and to the free choice of individuals. "All men," he adds, "take not this word, . . . he that can take, let him take it." St. Paul, giving an inspired commentary on those words, writes: "Now concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord, but I give counsel;" and in another passage, speaking of widows, he says: "But more blessed shall she be, if she so remain, according to my counsel." Virginity, then, by the teaching of Christ and of his apostles, though more excellent than matrimony, does not fall under any precept; there is no obligation by divine law of embracing a life of celibacy; but for those who feel themselves called thereunto there is a counsel. "I say to the unmarried and to the widows," adds the apostle, "it is good for them if they so continue, even as I."

In the text cited above, our Lord, after having recommended to the young man the renunciation of all his goods in order to gain perfection, immediately subjoined, "and come, follow me." The relation that exists between both members of the phrase clearly suggests that the perfection that is to be gained by voluntary poverty is correlated to the perfection that is to be found in the following of Christ; or that, as the renunciation of all temporal goods is a great instrument for sanctification, so, for the same end, the giving up of one's own will in all things for Christ's sake is a most effectual means. To the same purport is that other divine saying: "If any one will come after me, let him deny himself, take up his cross, and follow me." Whenever or wherever a divine precept is to be complied with, this self-denial is a strict duty; obedience is, then, of obligation. Men, if they be only sincere followers of Christ, must then renounce their own wills to follow His will, whether this be declared by express definite commandments, or be signified by those who have authority from Him. Beyond, however, the sphere of precepts there is a vast field of human activity in which man is not bound by any positive divine commandment. In that field, for his greater abnegation and for the greater love of Christ, he may do what legitimate authority tells him will be acceptable to the Divine Majesty; and then he will obey, not in virtue of a precept, but through the grace of a counsel. Thus, when the human will surrenders itself unreservedly in the spirit of self-denial, to do Christ's will as manifested by particular law or by the orders of superiors; when it depends in

all things on that will as its rule, then the words of Christ are realized to their full extent,—the abnegation of oneself becomes complete in the matter of obedience.

Indeed, so clearly marked in Holy Writ are the laws of the counsel as separate from the words of the commandments that Suarez writes: "The distinction between the counsels and the commandments rests on faith so certain, and is so expressly mentioned in Holy Scripture, and is so taught by the universal Church, that it cannot be denied without manifest heresy."

This being laid down, a further inquiry is, whether the embracing or the confirmation of the evangelical counsels by vows enters into the scope of Christ's teaching.

A vow is a free, deliberate promise made to God of something of superior excellence—*de bono meliore*; it is a law which one, of his own free choice, imposes on himself. If its subject-matter be a counsel, this, under the obligation of a vow, becomes, for him who takes it, a precept whose violation is a sin and whose observance is an act or an exercise of the virtue of religion. Hence, in the very first epochs of the history of God's people, vows received a special Divine sanction. Jacob's vow, given in the twenty-eighth chapter of Genesis, is the first of which a record has come down to us, while the blessings that he afterwards got prove that his vow was received with Divine favor. In the one hundred and thirty-first Psalm, David "vowed a vow" to build a temple to God, and how acceptable such a vow was to the Divine Majesty we learn from the seventh chapter of the second book of Kings. The tenor of many other passages in the Old Testament shows that one of the special ways by which the Jewish people honored and worshipped God was the taking of vows. All along, from the beginning, the taking of vows had received among them, time and again, the Divine sanction; to it they had recourse when pressed by calamity or when demanding particular favors, or, again, when striving to make amends for past obstinacy. They felt, and they knew from revelation, that the sacrifice of the will through the obligation of a solemn promise was most acceptable to the Lord. Of this they had a suggestive proof also in the exactness with which He required the fulfilment of vows. "When thou hast made a vow to the Lord thy God," it was said in the twenty-third chapter of Deuteronomy, "thou shalt not delay to pay it, because the Lord thy God will require it. And if thou delay, it shall be imputed to thee for a sin."

The practice of taking vows to God had come down to men, then, from the tradition of primitive revelations; in its own peculiar nature it bore an analogy to the custom by which men bind themselves by solemn engagements to each other, and was

grounded not only on religion, but also on the principles of the moral law. The Mosaic dispensation confirmed that practice anew, and, when the ceremonial part of that dispensation ceased, men continued to vow as before, since the obligations of the moral law, and these, too, sanctioned by revealed religion, never ceased to bind consciences. Under the Gospel the moral teaching of the past was ratified by Divine authority. Christ, our Lord, threw around the moral code the light of his own revelations, opened up the springs of human conduct, and pointed out distinctly the aim or the end of human life. More than ever before the trials of that life were depicted for men, while a higher standard of virtue was proposed to them; supernatural aids which they formerly had not were now given to them; they had before them, for their Divine model, the life of God incarnate; and the royal way of the holy cross, they were told, was the way that led to victory. Whatever had braced the soul for special combats, as it were, under the old law, was now imperatively required under the new; and all the strength that vows had given to hearts in former times was now particularly called for in the case of those who, following closely their Divine Master, aspired to religious perfection. It is said, indeed, by some of the Fathers of the Church—such as St. Cyril and St. Jerome—that the prophets of old, in speaking of vows, had sometimes chiefly in view the Christian dispensation. To their prophetic vision the Kingdom of God on earth—"the New Jerusalem"—appeared in all its magnificence, governed by an eternal priesthood and sanctified by "a clean offering" "from the rising of the sun even to the going down" thereof. In that "city of God"—the "glorious church not having spot or wrinkle"—to the prophetic eye there also appeared charity, linking souls to God and to each other, and drawing hearts, through Divine grace and the habits of self-denial, to an entire offering of themselves to the Divine goodness.

With the traditions of the synagogue around him and in the light of the revelations of Christ, St. Paul, joining, so to say, in his own person, the Old Testament and the New by the same religious bonds, had taken a vow, as St. Luke informs us. What he might have done by vowing in honor of God as a son of Abraham he felt he could now do, and that with greater fervor, as a disciple of Christ. The transition from one covenant to the other did not, he was aware, change the aspirations of souls for perfection, but rather increased them, since Christ came to cast on earth the fire of Divine love, and His will is that it be enkindled in hearts. Of this love vows were to be an expression, and to denote, under new forms, a spirit of self-sacrifice and a law for the gaining of greater intimacy with God. As appertaining to Divine worship, they were



to fall also under the legislation of the Church and be regulated by it. Looking, therefore, to the fidelity implied by them, St. Paul, in his First Epistle to Timothy, denounces the wantonness of widows, "who, having made void their first faith, married again." "They had taken a vow," says St. Augustine, commenting on this text, "and had not kept it." The violation of the law which they had voluntarily imposed on themselves explains the severity of the Apostle's denunciation.

The doctrine which the Apostle taught, he had learned from his Divine Master. He knew explicitly, from Divine revelation, "the mind of Christ" when it was often hidden in His words. To St. Paul, as well as to the other apostles, were given by our Lord, after His resurrection, lessons which related to "the Kingdom of God," and which were to enter forever into the body of Catholic traditions. But the very words in which Christ promulgated the counsels contained also implicitly a counsel for the vowing of them. He pointed out means for furthering the gaining of perfection, intending surely that these means should be used not only for some years, but during the whole lifetime. One was not to put his hand to the plough and then to look back, but to persevere unto the end in the way on which he had entered. Hence the recommendation of our Lord was meant not merely for the will in its first purpose, but for the will immovably bound to that purpose by a solemn engagement or by vow. To embrace poverty and afterwards, from caprice, to put it aside, would certainly not correspond with Christ's intention in marking out for some of His followers a special way of virtuous living. According to His counsel, to give up the possession of one's goods implies not only the surrendering of the actual right to them, but also the right of reclaiming them at any future time, since one gives up everything fully and completely only when, by promise, he has made it unlawful for him to possess anything as his own in the present and future. In recommending the counsel of poverty Christ undoubtedly did so also in this latter and fullest sense, and it was in this sense that the Apostles said: "Behold! we have left all things and followed Thee." "By which words," says St. Thomas, following the interpretation of the Fathers of the Church, "the Apostles are understood to have vowed whatever belongs to the state of perfection." They, who were to be to the world the heralds of evangelical virtue, professed it certainly in its most complete form.

According to ancient Christian tradition, too, the narrative given by St. Luke of the manner of life of the first Christian converts in Jerusalem, implies that they confirmed by vow their renunciation of all earthly goods. To this conclusion the sin and punishment of Ananias and Saphira clearly point. Had they not taken a vow,

and, by reserving to themselves some of their goods, committed sacrilege by lying to the Holy Ghost, it is hard to understand how their punishment could be proportioned to their guilt; for, though the sin of Ananias was barely a lie and hypocrisy, it was not a sin against justice, nor against charity, nor against the reverence due to God. It must have been, then, only the violation of a vow that gave to the sin its heinous character. In this sense it is that St. Athanasius speaks of the fact in his sermon on the passion and cross of Christ. "As Ananias and Saphira," writes the holy doctor, "after they had made vows to God withdrew from the same vows, deceiving others; but Peter, the minister of truth, thrust them from him, saying: 'You have lied, not to men, but to God.'"

And St. Gregory the Great writes, in a letter to Venantius: "Ananias had vowed money, from which, afterwards overcome by the persuasion of the devil, he took away something; but with what a death he was punished you are aware."

Again, the first beatitude, as given by St. Matthew, counsels, in the opinion of many Fathers of the Church, the vow of voluntary poverty. By the beatitude our Lord also intended, no doubt, to teach the virtue of humility, or poverty of affection, but the woes which St. Luke records as a kind of counterpart to the beatitudes, show that by "the poor in spirit" Christ had perhaps mainly in view the voluntarily poor. He said: "Blessed are ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of heaven." And afterwards, to bring out, as it were, more strikingly the blessedness which He promised, He subjoined: "But woe to you that are rich, for you have your consolation." He promises a kingdom to the poor, a reward which suggests the giving up of all things in this world for Christ's sake. Both in deed and affection He himself had given up all things and thus sanctified poverty, and surely to vow what had been thus sanctified must be most commendable and meritorious in the eyes of God. The vow gives a new value to the counsel, since to vow according to Catholic teaching is to perform an act of Divine worship. It is, moreover, not only to consecrate one's actions to God, but also the faculties from which these actions proceed, or, as St. Anselm remarks, it is to give to God not only the fruit but the tree also.

A line of argument similar to that just given leads to the same conclusion in regard to the vow of chastity. This counsel, as we have seen, was proposed in the nineteenth chapter of the Gospel of St. Matthew, on the occasion of the Apostle's asking an explanation of the law of marriage originally given by God, but in some instances dispensed with for special causes by Moses. After having explained how, by a defect of nature or by the physical action of men, the law of generation is in some cases frustrated,

Christ adds: "And there are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven. He that can take, let him take it." The antithesis between these words and the context evidently indicates a solemn promise or vow as a cause of continency. Those to whom allusion is made have, by a voluntary engagement, made it unlawful for themselves to contract marriage. Not obliged to celibacy by any natural or physical cause, since Christ excludes this; not constrained to it also by any common law of Christian life, it follows that they are bound to it only by a law arising from their own free act or vow. After this manner St. Epiphanius, St. Augustine, St. Jerome and Fulgentius interpret the aforesaid words of Christ.

The same thesis is still more clearly proved from the text before cited of St. Paul to Timothy, in which he writes of some younger widows, "that when they have grown wanton in Christ they will marry. Having damnation because they have made void their first faith." The Apostle had taught elsewhere that death dissolves the marriage bond. It is not, therefore, on account of a second marriage that a widow is in a state of "damnation;" nor can it be even for a sin of incontinency, since she does not thereby violate her first faith; but her sin is that, having taken a vow of chastity or having pledged her faith to Christ, her spiritual spouse, she violated it by marrying again. It is only the violation of a vow that could entail such punishment as the Apostle mentions. For the interpretation of the text just given there is, according to Suarez, a consensus of Greek and Latin Fathers, and the "consensus Patrum" is a certain rule of belief.

This vow of chastity has been especially dear to the Church from the very beginning. The fragrance of virginity was all around her at her very rising, and virgins were the object of her special attention. St. Ignatius of Antioch, the disciple of St. Polycarp, who himself was a disciple of St. John, wrote of virgins, "being consecrated to God, they are to be honored," and that "they are to remember to whom they have consecrated themselves." In the third century Tertullian and St. Cyprian wrote treatises on "the veiling of virgins,—*de velandis virginibus*." The same spirit of love for virginity is traceable through the legislation of the primitive Church. In the third book of the Apostolic Constitutions, ascribed to Pope St. Clement, the disciple of St. Peter, it is prescribed that vows are not to be taken rashly or without due consideration. In the Council of Ancyra, in 310, it was decreed that those who put aside their vow of virginity and married were to be held guilty of bigamy. The General Council of Chalcedon ordained that monks or nuns who, after having taken vows, attempted to marry should be excommunicated. The like teaching runs through



the acts of the Popes Sergius, St. Leo the Great, Gelasius and St. Gregory the Great.

The vow of chastity, then, as a means of gaining perfection and as a sacrifice most agreeable to God, has ever been, from the very dawn of Christianity, before the mind of the Church. It could not forget the example of the glorious and Immaculate Virgin Mother of God, or the solemn promise of virginity with which she had consecrated herself to her Maker, since it is only on the supposition of the virgin's vow that, according to the great doctors of the Church, her words in answer to the message of the archangel can be explained. This is the doctrine which St. Gregory of Nyssa lays down in his sermon on the birth of Christ; and St. Augustine, in his book on virginity, on the words of the Virgin, "How shall this be done, because I know not man?" writes: "She would certainly not have said this had she not formerly vowed her virginity to God." The Virgin's whole soul in the spirit of charity, suggests St. Anselm, was intent only on this, namely, to consecrate her body and soul, by perpetual virginity, to God. And thus it has come to pass that this truth, like a beauteous star, has cast its mild, soft light, in every age, on the Christian world. In the mysteriousness of Divine revelations the Virgin had taken her vow, and, though afterwards betrothed to St. Joseph, she knew from God that that vow would remain inviolate. "A just man," Joseph himself, as ancient Christian tradition teaches, had also vowed chastity to God and become the guardian of the Virgin and of her Divine child—a shield of defence for them against the calumnies and plotting of Jewish enemies.

The counsel of obedience, as we have seen, was proposed by our Lord, in the invitation which he gave to the young man to follow him, as well as in the more general statement that, "If any one will come after me, let him deny himself, take up his cross and follow me." Here, however, we wish to examine whether the vow of obedience was inculcated by the same divine teaching.

A most striking feature of Christ's teaching, in general, was its plain, simple, practical character. There was nothing like mere theory in it; it was not formally based on reasoning from induction or deduction, was not the result of human experience or a summary of the views of former ages. On the contrary, it ran counter to most of the philosophy of the time, brought out prominently virtues that were ignored by Jew and Gentile, and put into the mind of the world ideas for all time and for all peoples. The authoritative manner in which that teaching was given, the luminousness with which it shone in on the soul as on its fitting abode, and the elevation which it gave to human nature, made it to be a new light for the world. Men might know, even from Christ's method of

teaching, that it was God Himself who spoke with them. He began by building up the soul, and then laid down rules for human conduct. Faith, according to His doctrine, was to be the first great element of supernatural life, and the key to the knowledge of supernatural things; while the following of Himself, or the imitation of His life, was to be the practical rule for all those who wish to be saved. This rule men can observe more or less closely; in its essential form, or as it is marked out by the commandments, it has to be observed by all the faithful. Every one who wishes to gain salvation must follow Christ in this manner, he must be ready to die sooner than commit a mortal sin, and to forfeit the whole world sooner than lose his own soul. He who tramples on Christ's law and is thus estranged from Him by grievous sin, does not follow Him, but rather Satan, or the world, or the flesh.

To observe the commandments, then, is the first necessary condition for following Christ, and those who fulfil it are on the way to salvation. But the generosity of divine love will induce many of the faithful not to stop at that, or not to measure their devotion by the bare fulfilment of the precepts. They will wish to observe not only these, but the counsels also, in order to follow Christ more closely, and to imitate Him in that which was the great distinctive feature of His life, obedience; "becoming obedient unto death, even to the death of the cross." In the abnegation which this obedience supposes there are, of course, different degrees. Some will purpose to follow Christ as faithfully and as closely as they can, but will, however, retain the power of limiting the extent of their obedience. They will follow Christ, but still with some reservation. Others will follow Him in all things and at all times, putting no restriction on their obedience save that which sin puts on it, and surrendering their free power of choice by solemn engagement to Christ through the representatives of his authority on earth. They retain no dominion over themselves, but, to gain true liberty within the laws of the just and the holy, give up the natural liberty with which they are endowed, and thus become "free by the freedom with which Christ has made us free." It was to this liberty through the laws of obedience that He called His Apostles. They gave up in the spirit of self-denial all external goods, together with certain gratifications of the body, for God's sake; and not only that, but they vowed their understanding, will and soul in Christ's service. "Behold," said they, "we have left all things and have followed Thee. What, therefore, shall we have?" The reward which they here look for supposes the labor of the entire life as well as its duties solemnly engaged to Christ; they had not, of course, then actually lived out their whole lives, since life is made up of successive moments; but because they had solemnly dedicated those lives to

Christ, they speak of them as if already spent, or as offerings permanently and irrevocably consecrated to Him. They were in a special manner, and according to a special subordination, His disciples; they had received from Him particular precepts and a commission to preach the Gospel, and were "the foundation" of the Church, of which St. John wrote: "And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb." From the office, therefore, which they received from Christ as well as from their profession of obedience sprang their unchangeableness of resolution, since, as St. Thomas teaches, "this unchangeableness in the following of Christ is rendered firm by vow." By this, as it binds up, as it were, in a moment a lifetime through the force of an obligation, one is enabled to offer, all at once, to God his whole life in abnegation and obedience. Hence, as man's will is that which is dearest to him, his greatest renunciation will lie in surrendering, in what is lawful, his will to him who holds authority from Christ, and who in virtue of his office is, in regard to those subject to him, in the place of Christ. To His disciples, and in their persons undoubtedly to all in His Church having power from Him, our Lord said: "He who hears you hears me, and he who despises you despises me." On this subject St. Basil writes: "The superior of those who have taken a vow of obedience to Him represents in their regard the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, performing the office of mediator between God and men, and offering to God in sacrifice the wills of those who profess to obey Him."

In the ears of the primitive Church the words of Christ, as He invited men to the higher life of the counsels, were continually ringing. Conduct, they knew, was the great proof of love, and the measure of that love was the abnegation practiced for Christ's sake. They heard repeated to them, that the rewards of the perfect are the treasures of heaven, and that every one that "hath left house or brethren or sisters or father or mother or wife or children or lands for my name's sake, shall receive a hundred-fold and shall possess life everlasting." These texts and similar ones were present to the minds of the first generations of Christians. They knew, moreover, from the teaching of the Old Law, that a seal, so to say, of perfection, is a vow, since it implies a special dedication to virtuous living, and they had read it in the book of Numbers: "When a man or woman shall make a vow to be sanctified, and will consecrate themselves to the Lord, . . . . all the days of separation he shall be holy to the Lord." And again, "This is the law of the Nazarite, when he hath vowed his obligation to the Lord in the time of his consecration." With this divine teaching before them, and in the fervor of their love for Christ, many of the Christians of



the Apostolic Church, in view of the highest perfection, made by vows an entire offering of themselves to God. In this sense, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome and St. Augustine understand the fourth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and with their opinions before him, St. Thomas pronounces, doctrinally, that "it was from the disciples of Christ that all religious life took its origin." St. Chrysostom styles the religious life "a philosophy introduced by Christ," and Suarez holds that the Apostles themselves took the three vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, as belonging to the state of perfection.

As a corollary, then, from the premises which we have been laying down, it follows that from the profession of the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience there results a state of perfection or the religious state. That is, a state whose principal end is the perfection of charity, and whose means for attaining that end are chiefly the facility and peace and firmness which spring from the obligations of vows.

A state of life, when there is question of persons, implies, according to Suarez, two things (1), "perfection in some condition or mode of existence; (2), rest and stability therein." The latter requires a certain adhesion of the person to the state or an obligation of remaining in it, and this obligation again must come from something like a permanent cause, or from a cause morally permanent. The ever-varying accidents of life, then, do not make a state. A servant, by the mere fact of his obeying his master, is not in a state, since, at his will, he can change his condition; neither is he in a new state who happens to obtain some civil office, which confers a dignity but does not make a state. But persons are said to be in a state of sin, since they are in a state of bondage, arising from the impossibility in which the sinner is of freeing himself from his sinfulness by his own natural power, while the just are said to be in a state of grace, having an obligation of serving God, and possessing His divine help, which, of itself, is a support of their state. And thus they are in a state of bondage to God, but this bondage is true liberty.

A state for acquiring Christian perfection, therefore, or the perfection of charity, implies a fixed condition of life in view of that end; it also imports the removal of what impedes the practice of charity and has coupled with it certain stated exercises which relate to the worship and glory of God. It is the obligations which are contracted that go to make the state. Hence, those who bind themselves by a vow of chastity, as all those who receive holy orders in the Latin Church, are "inchoative," as Suarez writes, or, in a limited sense, in a certain state of perfection. But the state, properly and simply so called for acquiring Christian perfection, is

the religious state. It alone embraces all the means marked out in the Gospel for furthering the soul in the practice of virtue, it removes all these general impediments to charity which spring from our fallen nature, and invites and prepares persons, if they be willing, to gain higher and higher degrees of charity. It supplies instruments for the acquiring of virtue, but, by itself, does not make persons virtuous. The religious state springs essentially from the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, approved and accepted by the Church; but, as the doctor just quoted remarks, other obligations than those arising from vows the Church may take to constitute a state of perfection.

In religious life, then, the obligations which come from vows give to it stability or a moral firmness on one unchangeable plane, and thus make it a state—a school for the exercising and acquiring of Christian perfection. Outside of that state, most certainly, persons can attain the greatest sanctity by the practice of charity, which is “the bond of perfection;” they may also minister to others with great zeal and merit, but for all that, though, perhaps, individually perfect in a high degree, they are not in a regularly constituted state for acquiring perfection. “For one,” writes St. Thomas, “is properly said to be in a state of perfection, not because he elicits an act of perfect charity, but because he binds himself forever in a certain solemn ceremony to these things which belong to perfection.” In another passage, he explains what these things are and how they help to the forming of the soul to perfection. They are,—the vow of poverty, which cuts off all solicitude and cupidity about earthly possessions; the vow of chastity, which forbids all deliberate sensuality; and the vow of obedience, which excludes a badly regulated will. All the other observances of religious life are in some way directed to these laws of the vows, and form that discipline of life and give that freedom of mind which promote the exercise of charity. To perfection, therefore, it belongs not only to do what is perfect, but also to vow what is perfect. To observe continence is in itself a perfection, but to observe the same under the obligation of a vow is not only to practice the virtue of continence, but also that of religion, or to acquire a double perfection. To be poor for Christ’s sake merits His special graces, but to become professionally poor by vow is to add religious consecration to the virtue of poverty. To practice obedience according to Christ’s law is most commendable, but to subject one’s will by vow to the mighty will of God, and, in Christ’s language, to lose one’s soul for His sake, is more pleasing to God than sacrifices. “Obedience is better than sacrifices.”

But the highest state of perfection on earth is the episcopate; it is “*perfectionis magisterium*,” as St. Thomas calls it. It is not a

state for acquiring perfection as the religious state is, but a state of perfection already acquired, and that especially in behalf of others. Religious are bound only to tend to perfection, bishops are bound to possess it; the obligations of religious spring from their vows, those of bishops from their pastoral charges. In the case of the former, the removal of obstacles to their perfection is required; in that of the latter, as their high office implies, such removal is not deemed necessary. Bishops are considered to have acquired that degree of perfection which needs not those means supplied by vows for the exercise of charity. They are the successors of the Apostles, the Council of Trent teaches; "they are the pillars of the Church," writes St. Athanasius; and "nothing is more sublime than the episcopacy," remarks St. Ambrose. "It behooveth a bishop to be blameless," says St. Paul.

For the reception and exercise of the priesthood, and especially in its plenitude as bishops receive it, great interior perfection or holiness is required. Still the sacramental character which they receive in consecration does not of itself place them, strictly speaking, in a state of perfection. Holy Orders fit one for sacred functions, but do not make a state of perfection. By the fact, St. Thomas teaches, "that one receives Holy Orders, he is not thereby put in a state of perfection, although in him interior perfection is required that he may worthily exercise the sacred ministry." The episcopal state arises especially from the bishop's obligations to his flock; it is these moral obligations which condition it as a state, and give to it its stability; and it is from the same obligations that the perfection of the state results. A bishop, in taking the pastoral office, binds himself irrevocably to his see and to all that belongs to the perfection of his state. Nay, even, if circumstances should require it, he is bound to lay down his life for his flock. "The perfection of the episcopal state," writes the aforementioned great doctor, "consists in this, namely, that the bishop, through a motive of great divine love, binds himself to labor for the salvation of the neighbor, and on that account to retain his pastoral charge as long as he can promote the spiritual welfare of those intrusted to his care." It is not permitted to a bishop, then, to lay down his crosier without the Pope's special dispensation, and without the same it is not allowed to him to join a religious order, or to assume an inferior grade in the ministry, in order to curtail the responsibilities of his office, although both of these changes priests in their own sphere of duties can canonically adopt. The bonds of the bishop can be loosened only by the Bishop of bishops, the successor of St. Peter.

It is of faith that the episcopate is of divine institution; it is also a point of Catholic teaching that the religious state, as to its funda-



mental principles (substantialia), is of divine right (de jure non precipiente sed consulente, writes Suarez). But the determination of that state to this or that form under the sanction of the Church has come from men guided, no doubt, by the Holy Spirit. Christ Himself, all Christian antiquity teaches, sowed the seeds of religious life and put them together with the grace of His words into the great heart of the Church. His will was that they should grow and produce fruit, and that that fruit should remain. But to suppose that His words of life remained dead for ages, that the seed of those words had fallen altogether by "the way-side" or on "stony ground," or that no hearts were found good enough to thoroughly correspond with it until the time of St. Anthony, would seem like derogating from the efficacy of divine grace. The history of the very first ages of the Church does away with such a supposition.

The inspired record of St. Luke, as we have seen, teaches how the first glow of devotion took the multitude of Christian converts beyond the observance of the commandments to the observance of the counsels. In their fervor they wished to imitate Christ as closely as they could; and, after the manner in which circumstances permitted it, dedicated themselves by a solemn engagement to God's service. Even then, sacred virgins consecrated themselves by special vow to God. Iphigenia, we are told, was received to the profession of virginity by St. Matthew, Thecla by St. Paul, and Petronilla by St. Peter.

What St. Luke writes of the Christians of Jerusalem, that St. Jerome writes of the Christians of Alexandria under St. Mark. In his work on *Ecclesiastical Writers*, he says of the Evangelist: "Having taken with him the Gospel which he had finished, he went into Egypt, and, first announcing Christ at Alexandria, founded a Church noted for such doctrine and continency of life that all the converts to Christianity followed his example. Afterwards Philo, a most eloquent Jew, seeing the first church at Alexandria still observing some legal ceremonies, wrote a book on their way of life, and in praise of his own race, and as St. Luke relates that the faithful in Jerusalem had all things in common, so he (Philo) also has recorded what he saw practiced at Alexandria under the great teacher St. Mark."<sup>1</sup> That Philo speaks of Christians and not of Jews in the work alluded to by St. Jerome has, I think, been satisfactorily proved by Cardinal Baronius and by Natalis Alexander. The Jewish author describes in detail what was the manner of life of these early Christian ascetics; how they loved solitude and practiced mortification and prayer; how they studied Holy Scriptures, and meditated on them, and how they offered praise to God,

<sup>1</sup> The testimony of St. Jerome is confirmed by that of Eusebius of Cesarea.

and listened to the instructions of their teachers. He calls them Therapeutæ, either because they offered pure worship to God, or because they cured their own souls and the souls of others by freeing them from sin.

Many writers have also quoted on this subject the testimony of St. Dionysius the Areopagite, in his book on the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*. In it the very rites are prescribed for the initiation of the monk into the life of perfection which he proposes to lead; he is to give himself up, we are told, to the contemplation of the divine mysteries, to perform his actions with great holiness, and to attend to his sanctification under the direction of the bishops. Grave critics, however, deny the genuineness of this work, as well as of the other writings attributed to the convert of St. Paul. They were not written, they maintain, by him, but by an author of the fourth or fifth century under the assumed name of the Areopagite; just as St. Sylvanus, they say, wrote under the name of Timothy, and Vincent of Lerins under that of Peregrinus. But waiving the question of the genuineness of the works of St. Dionysius, the argument derived from the esteem with which they were held in the Church retains still much of its persuasiveness. Reference is made to them in a Lateran council in 649, and again in the sixth general council in 680, and by Pope St. Agatho in a letter to Constantine Pogonatus, confirming the acts of the same council. They are mentioned by the Popes St. Gregory the Great, Adrian I., Nicolas I., by Archbishop Hincmar, by Anastasius the Librarian, by Photius, by St. John Damascene, and by St. Thomas Aquinas, who has commented on them. Now, all through the Christian ages no exception was taken to the Areopagite's teaching on the beginnings of the religious life, and no one objected to it, because, undoubtedly, it was somehow in accordance with the ancient traditions of the Church on the origin of the practice of the evangelical counsels. No innovation was noticed in the passage referred to from the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, because it only determined in a particular way the teaching of St. Luke, or, perhaps, because it assigned a definite date for the original institution of cenobites, who afterwards, under St. Anthony, filled Egypt with their piety.

And, indeed, it is a saying of some of the early Fathers of the Church, that St. John the Baptist was the first monk, as the Apostles were the first priests. They also refer to the apostolic college as a model of a perfect religious community. St. Augustine says of himself, that, following the example of the Apostles, he strove to lead a life of perfection, and Pope Pius IV., in a Bull issued in behalf of the clerks-regular of St. Augustine, speaks of them as having been instituted by the Apostles. The writings of Tertullian and St. Cyprian suggest that down from the apostolic age the

tradition of the religious life was kept up in one way or another. About the year 250 the life of the anchorets becomes known in history through St. Paul the hermit, and shortly after, the cenobitical life is illustrated by the life of St. Anthony. He did not institute monasticism, but perfect it. "He exhorted all," says St. Athanasius, "to prefer nothing in the world to the love of Christ." "He was like a physician given by God to Egypt. For who met him grieving, and did not go away rejoicing? Who came mourning over his dead, and did not forthwith lay aside his grief? Who came wrathful, and was not converted to friendship? What poor man came wearied . . . and did not despise wealth and comfort himself in his poverty?" In him the great animating central principle of religious life was exemplified,—a principle which when fully realized elevates the mind, broadens the heart and ennobles the whole being. It is "the principle of *heroic love* thrown into system by the saints;" *love*—for it is the entire abandonment of self for Christ's sake in order to serve him with all devotedness; *heroic*,—because self, with all that the world can give, and natural affection and self-love suggest, is sacrificed through the soul's energy for God's love by the sword of the Spirit.

But during those first ages of the Church, the sword of the persecutor was almost always unsheathed against the Christians. In town and country their footsteps were dogged by Roman imperial agents, so that amid such difficulties the Christians' greatest safeguard was not to attract notice by any new form or manner of life. Men and women aspiring then to high Christian perfection strove as best they could to carry out their holy purposes privately or under the common conditions of social life; though even then, during, perhaps, the bloodiest of all the persecutions, that of Domitian, we read of a convent of fifty virgins on the borders of the Roman empire, at Nisibis in Mesopotamia. But when peace and liberty were given to the Church by Constantine, the spirit of piety, that had been pent up, burst forth like "a mighty wind," and bore thousands of Christians into the desert, there under rule to lead lives of religious perfection.

The history of the Church bears ample testimony in every age to the devotedness and labors of religious orders. Along the line of centuries, amid the ravages of barbarians and the strifes of peoples and the inroads of heresy, the religious life has been light as well as life for the world. "From monasteries piously instituted and rightly governed," says the Council of Trent, "splendor and utility have come to the Church." In our time, summing up the traditional glories of the religious state, Pope Pius IX. styled religious orders "those chosen phalanxes of the army of Christ which have always been the bulwark and ornament of the Christian



republic as well as of Christian society." Far back in the Christian ages, when the Church was shaken to her foundation by heresy, and when mercenaries, instead of true pastors, were within her sanctuary, it was Athanasius, who had lived in the desert for some years under St. Anthony, that in the first general council, with God's power and grace, victoriously upheld faith in the divinity of Christ. In the fourth and fifth centuries, especially when the offshoots of Arianism were continually appearing, some of the greatest champions of orthodoxy came forth from the cloister. By their writings they opened up the sources of Catholic truth, unfolded divine revelation, by the force of genius linked together Catholic doctrines, and thus became, in the Church of God, for all future ages, "the light of the world." Catholic teaching will always turn for guidance to such doctors as Saints Gregory of Nazianzen and Nyssa, Saints Basil and Chrysostom, Saints Jerome and Augustine and Gregory the Great. In those by-gone times, it not unfrequently happened that when Catholic faith was trampled on by unfaithful guardians, it found a secure asylum among the monks in their monasteries. "His monasteries," says Cardinal Newman, writing of St. Basil, "became, in a short time, schools of that holy teaching which had been almost banished from the sees of Asia; and it is said that he was in the practice of making a circuit of the neighboring towns, from time to time, to preach to them the Nicene doctrine. This, indeed, was a benefit which was not unfrequently rendered to the Church, in that hour of apostasy, by these ascetics, and for which we who now live have reason to be grateful to them."

Another great splendor, arising to the Church from religious orders, has been the preaching of the Gospel. It was they who, in the early mediæval period, gave those men who converted some twenty barbarous tribes and made them the parents of so many Christian nations. Having received a commission from the vicar of Christ, the successor of St. Peter, to preach the Gospel, monks went forth to plant the cross in lands whither the legions of imperial Rome had never gone. Their only arms were their virtues. "In hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness," they preached Christ crucified, and often sealed their testimony of Him with their life-blood. Their monastic homes, the centres of industrial activity, as well as the centres of enlightenment for the neighboring tribes, they established in the open plains or on the mountain-side or in the depths of the forests. After they had taught barbarians how to live as Christian men, they instructed them, under the guidance of the Church, how to live as members of society. The spirit which swayed the monastic preaching of the mediæval period is that which has animated the preachers of re-

ligious orders in modern times. Their great final aim has been always the same, namely, to gain souls to Christ, to bring them to repent of past sins, to subdue, to pacify and discipline them in accordance with Christian law, and to make them live with hope as heirs of the Kingdom of God. But though their final object has always been the same, the enemies whom the missionaries of latter times have had to contend with are different from those of the former period, and the field of their labors, owing to the discovery and exploration of foreign lands, has grown more vast than that of their predecessors. Heresy had now put on new features, or rather had fitted heresies of the past to the corrupt spirit of the age, and thus separated whole nations from the fold of Christ. Under the direction of the Popes and of the bishops, the members of religious orders went forth to battle with this new enemy. They preached from pulpits and by the way-side, lectured in the schools, explained the true faith before assembled national conventions, grappled with their adversaries in close controversy and compelled heresiarchs to fall back and shift their position or to abdicate their errors. The contest for truth was a long one; in Germany, according to Lord Macaulay, Protestantism was driven back to the German Ocean; in England and Ireland missionaries had a price set upon their heads, and lived under the shadow of the rack and the gibbet in order to preserve the faith of the people.

But their labors among heathen nations and tribes in distant lands are one of the noblest monuments of the zeal of religious orders. Over the whole globe there is not a country that does not bear witness in their behalf, and no others are there to whom may be so justly applied the words of the poet:

*"Quæ regio in terris nostri non plena laboris."*

India and Japan and China have not lost the inheritance of the faith that had been given and secured to them by the members of religious orders. By them also the cross of Christ was borne into the heart of Africa and into the various islands of the ocean. To-day in those same countries, as well as in all other heathen lands, members of the same religious families are, as of old, actively engaged in their apostolic missions.

In America, too, the first preachers of the Catholic faith were men vowed to God's service in religious life. Amid hardships and dangers of every kind they sought the Indians in their wilds, lived among them, and comforted and civilized them. Along the banks of the Amazon, down the slopes of the Cordilleras to the coast of the Pacific, in the West India islands, the missionaries were the Indians' defenders against the tyranny of cruel masters, and succeeded sometimes in breaking the chains with which slavery had bound their poor neophytes. On the banks of the Paraguay

and the Parana they taught them how to use the implements of industry, how to conform to Catholic social life, and then how, by cultivation, to fertilize the soil until "the wilderness blossomed like the rose." The first to announce the Gospel in the northern part of this great continent were, again, members of the same religious bodies. Their names, it must be admitted by all, are at the very roots of its civilization, their history enters largely into its primitive annals, and the blood also of some among them as martyrs for the faith has entered into American earth on the coast of Florida and by the courses of the Rio Grande, of the Mohawk, of the Penobscot, and of the St. Lawrence. So that on Catholic truth, sealed with that blood, the Church of God rests here to-day in all her grandeur through the length and breadth of this Republic.

Through the influence of the Holy Spirit within the Church, another glory derived to her from the religious state has been the moulding of her doctrines into a scientific form. Every age has produced its own crop of error, has had its own social dangers and its own greater or less rationalistic tendencies. To keep back as much as possible this flood of evil, and to point out to men the way of truth and life, is the office of God's Church on earth,—an office which she has faithfully fulfilled through the course of ages. For centuries she had to defend Christ and his Blessed Mother against the insults of heresy. Later on, she had to meet not only single errors but also error put into system with all the subtlety and force that keen, well-trained intellects could give to it. Jew and Moslem, having mastered in their schools all the resources of dialectics, attacked by their aid the very fundamental principles of the Christian religion. In that crisis in the life of the Church, her great champions were scholars trained to knowledge in the cloister. With reason fully equipped in all the arts of logic, they braced, as it were, by the force of argument Christian truths, and made reason tell for faith, and faith enlighten reason. While the Crusaders were fighting the Saracen at Jerusalem, at Ascalon and Acre, those great Christian scholars were engaged in a still more vital struggle with him in the intellectual arena. They were victorious, and out of the contest came the great body of Christian truth—definite, proportioned, complete.

Again, in the sixteenth century, the life of the Church was fiercely assailed, heresy denied almost all Catholic doctrine, and tore up all the great landmarks of truth set up by Catholic teaching in the past. And again, to meet the objections raised by error, theology was unfolded with new vigor, and strengthened with new argument by the great teachers of religious bodies; so that, in the controversy, as far as argument went, heresy had no ground to



stand upon. Theology then received a new development, and, in the Church, still runs on, qualified, in matters of opinion, by the teaching of the great schools of her religious orders.

In enumerating the glories that have come to the Church from the religious state, those glories are not to be forgotten which she has gathered from her devoted daughters, the spouses of Christ in religion. Ever since the apostolic age these have been for her the sweet odor of Jesus Christ, and this, with a beautiful variety, according to their different callings. Some of them in seclusion, devoted to contemplation and prayer, and to the singing of the praises of the Lord, by their lives of penance make intercession for the sins of men. Others among them zealously devote themselves to the laborious work of education, or to the care of the sick, or to the solace of the aged and the poor, and that with a heroism of virtue which has won the admiration of men of every creed. Among the homes of savages, in the midst of heathen nations, on the battlefields even, through the islands of the seas as well as through the great cities of the world, those heroic spouses of Christ have ministered to Him, and, with their great charity around them, have been a light to the world.

But the greatest of the glories resulting to the Church from religious orders is the recognized sanctity of many of their deceased members. "Marked with the sign of the servants of our God," they stand "before the throne and in the sight of the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands." They are confessors, who "are come out of great tribulation," and with heroic fortitude confessed Christ before men; virgins, "purchased from among men the first-fruits to God," who "follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth;" martyrs, "who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb," and with their own blood have given to Christ the great testimony of love.

"Like the different forces of the same army," says an eloquent writer, "they (the religious orders) have displayed, even in the diversity of their rules and tendencies, that variety in unity which constitutes the fruitful loveliness and sovereign majesty of Catholicity, and, beyond this, have practiced, as far as consists with human weakness, those evangelical precepts, the accomplishment of which conducts to Christian perfection. Occupied, above all, in opening to themselves the way to heaven, they have given to the world the grandest and most noble of lessons in demonstrating how high a man can attain on the wings of love purified by sacrifice and of enthusiasm regulated by faith."

## THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF THE CHURCH IN REGARD TO EDUCATION.

*Acta et Decreta Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio Lacensis.* Herder, Friburgi Brisgoviæ.

*Der Moderne Staat und die Christliche Schule.* By Rev. Florian Riess, S. J. Herder, Friburg. 1868.

*Geschichte der Paedagogik.* By Dr. Albert Stökl. Kirchheim, Mainz. 1876.

*The Judges of the Faith and Godless Schools.* By Rev. Thomas J. Jenkins. Egan, New York. 1882.

IN a previous article, taking mainly the natural law for our guide, we endeavored to define the rights and duties of the family and State in matters of education, reserving those of the Church for future treatment. That the Church, according to the intention of her divine founder, should have certain invisible and inalienable rights, must be evident to all true believers in Christianity. Christ has given her a constitution, a social organization, independent of all human power. He has constructed her as a moral edifice upon the unshaken rock of unity, cemented with that divine authority with which He vested her rulers, the apostles and their successors, and chief of all, St. Peter and his followers, her supreme head. He has organized her into a body politic with superiors having power to command, to legislate, to direct, to coërcé; in short, endowed with all those legislative, judiciary and executive means necessary or conducive to her divine purpose, the direction of the faithful to their last end. To those rulers He gave the power of binding and loosing, *i.e.*, of imposing and dispensing with moral obligations, with such efficacy that their decisions should be ratified with divine sanction in heaven. This power has been granted to the Church, not for a time within certain limits, but unto the end of the world, independent of all circumstances, of all social and political changes.

Such a divine social organization as the Church is, must needs by her very constitution possess extensive rights. Chief among them is the right to *teach*, to educate. Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the way, the truth and the life, came into the world as a *master*, a *teacher*, a *prophet*. As such He was expected by the Jews; as such He manifested Himself as *the* Prophet, who taught as one having power, not as the Scribes and Pharisees. Through

Him God has spoken to the world, after having revealed Himself at divers times and in divers ways through the prophets of old.

But Christ's teaching was confined to a limited territory and a small portion of mankind. His mission was with the stray sheep of Israel's fold. The preaching of the gospel and the teaching of the nations He reserved for the Apostles and their followers. For this teaching office He instructed His Apostles with the greatest care during the three years of His public life. After having thus trained and prepared them He conferred upon them that inviolable charter available for all times and places: "All power is given to me in heaven and on earth; *going, therefore, teach ye all nations.*" To guide them unerringly in their teaching, He assured them of His assistance to the end of the world; "And behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world." He finally sealed their infallibility by the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on that memorable day of Pentecost, when parted tongues of fire descended upon them, and they began to speak in divers tongues the wonderful works of God. Thus trained, chartered, and armed with supernatural power, they went forth on their universal mission, according to the behests of their Lord, "in Jerusalem, and Judea, and Samaria, and even to the uttermost parts of the earth," and "they taught everywhere, the Lord working withal and confirming the word with the signs that followed." When brought before the authorities of the Synagogue and the State, and called to account for their conduct, they resolutely and unflinchingly answered: *non possumus*. "We cannot but speak the things we have seen and heard." "We ought to obey God rather than men." And this has ever since been the watch-word of the Church as often as her divine rights of education have been infringed upon by the abuse of the civil power, *non possumus*.

Nor were the Apostles satisfied with teaching by word of mouth; whenever necessity or utility suggested, they also had recourse to written instructions. They became all things to all men—Jew to the Jew, Greek to the Greek, barbarian to the barbarian, wise to the wise, and foolish to the foolish—to gain all to Christ. It is but natural, then, to expect that the Church should, in course of time, open schools, as the most effectual means of teaching the nations. Therefore we see already in the second century the first of the great *Catechetical Schools* flourishing in Alexandria, which was then a great centre of learning as well as commerce. This school, founded by the convert philosopher Pantaenus, has received undying fame from the names of St. Clement and Origen. Nor were these schools, as might be inferred from their names, institutions for mere religious instruction or the teaching of the Christian doctrine. All the arts and sciences of the time, especially



philosophy, rhetoric, and literature, were thoroughly and systematically taught in them. St. Gregory Thaumaturgus in a panegyric on Origen gives us a graphic sketch of that great teacher's method. "Before receiving students," he says, "Origen used to examine them by a series of questions to discover their defects and to try to correct them. He then taught them logic to whet their understanding—not, however, the logic common with ordinary philosophers, but the logic of common sense, which is necessary to all, Greeks and barbarians, the learned and the unlearned, in short, for all men, whatever vocation they may choose to follow. To logic he added natural philosophy, which he taught in such a manner as to illustrate and classify every single object, to reduce it by a simple exposition to its first elements, and explain the nature of the whole and its parts, and the various changes to which it was subject. This he did to inspire the pupil with a rational instead of an irrational admiration of nature. Then the student was introduced to the study of geometry, the firm and unshaken basis of all the other sciences, and astronomy, which contemplates the firmament and leads to the sublime and heavenly. After these preparatory studies he was taught moral philosophy, and herein Origen exhibited to all in himself the golden mirror of virtue and piety. He taught the student particularly to enter into his own spirit, to provide for the soul above all other things, and to practice piety. He then read with them the writings of the ancient philosophers and poets, except those who denied the Providence of God; for these were not considered fit to be read, lest by them the soul should be defiled. The student was made familiar with all the philosophical systems; wherein the teacher accompanied him in spirit, as on a journey, and led him, as it were, by the hand, when anything abstruse, doubtful, or deceptive presented itself; or, like an expert swimmer, to whom no feat is unknown or untried, who, being himself secure from all danger, stretches forth his hand to extricate and save others from drowning. The course of studies was concluded with the exposition of the sacred books and the Christian philosophy. . . ."

I have quoted this rather long passage to show how the Church from the very earliest ages was solicitous to teach not only the Christian doctrine, but the whole cyclopædia of the known sciences. Alexandria, however, was not the only Christian seat of learning of this kind in the first centuries of the Church. Similar though less celebrated institutions existed in Jerusalem, Antioch, Edessa, Cæsarea, Nisibis, Neocæsarea, Nicomedia, Smyrna, Nazianzen, Byzantium, Rome, Carthage, Hippo, Lyons, and other places. These schools were principally intended for adults, while the children were commonly instructed and educated in the Christian doc-

trine and Christian life, as well as in the elements of learning, privately by the parents, or, at least, under their immediate supervision, as was the custom among the Jews, Greeks and Romans in pre-Christian times.

There are, however, instances of Christian schools for children at a very early period. We meet with the first Christian elementary school in the second century at Edessa, where a priest, named Protogenes, taught the children to read and write and sing the psalms. Nor ought we to suppose that this school was the only one of the kind existing at this period. St. Basil the Great (379), who composed the rule of the Monks of the East, not only makes the education of youth one of their chief ministries, but also gives them circumstantial hints on the method of teaching and the conduct they are to pursue in this avocation. The bishops, following the example of St. Augustine, commonly supported and instructed at their houses or churches a number of boys, who formed a kind of diocesan seminary, and from whom the various ranks of the clergy were filled. The priests soon imitated their examples in their districts, and gathered a circle of boys around them whom they instructed in the Christian doctrine, ecclesiastical chant, and the rudiments of knowledge. This practice, which had been already inculcated in provincial synods, was universally sanctioned by the sixth ecumenical council at Constantinople (681), which prescribes that schools should be opened in all parishes (*per villas et vicos*). Besides, every monastery had invariably its school attached. Whence we find from the earliest ages, besides the higher institutions which coincide with the more modern *universities*, three classes of schools—the *episcopal*, corresponding to our seminaries, the *parochial*, and the *monastic* schools.

But soon the tide of the barbarians poured down upon civilized Europe, and almost swept away every vestige of Christianity and civilization. The light of faith and learning seemed for a time to be all but extinguished, and dismal darkness to hover over the face of Europe. But God, in His sweet Providence, chose a tiny islet in the western sea, which seemed to be out of the reach of civilization, to enkindle a new flame. This "gem of the ocean," illuminated by the ray of Christianity, was destined in a short time to shed its lustre over the known world. Its schools count by hundreds, and its students by tens of thousands. Such was their fame that they attracted the eager student in quest of learning and sanctity from all parts of Europe, even from the classic shores of Hellas, to drink at their pure and untainted fountains. Such was the efficiency of these institutions that they turned out hundreds of apostles to bear the good tidings of the Gospel and the light of civilization to the Scot, and the Pict, and the Anglo-Saxon, and

the Teuton, and the Swiss, and the Gaul, and even into the very heart of Italy, which was itself, both before and after, the centre of faith and civilization. We need only recall the names of Bangor in Ireland, or of sea-girt Iona on the wild Scottish coast, or of St. Gall in Switzerland, or of Bobbio on the plains of Lombardy, to remind the reader of what the Irish Church has done for the education and civilization of Europe. We need only mention the names of St. Columbkille, St. Columbanus, St. Gall, Sts. Kilian and Emmeran, St. Virgil of Salzburg. Such was the drift of Irish Apostles to the Continent of Europe, such was their influence on civilization, that a German writer of the ninth century (Emmerich von Reichenau) exclaims, with the pointedness and warmth peculiar to his time. "O, how could we ever forget Erin, from which such light and splendor has dawned upon us! For, though born in a land which lies to the East, the Sun of the Faith has arisen upon us, contrary to the 'course of nature, from the extreme West, whence he has gone forth in his splendor over all nations."

The fearless and enterprising sons of St. Benedict went forth from the Sunny South and met the sons of St. Patrick on their apostolic expeditions. To the Benedictines is mainly due the conversion and civilization of the Anglo-Saxon. Their first care on landing in Britain was to open schools. What manner of pupils they met with, we see in St. Aldhelm, Venerable Bede, Alfred the Great and Alcuin, who were prodigies of learning and burned with the desire of communicating their knowledge to their fellow-men. To these men humanity and education owe more than to generations of our modern noisy philanthropic educators. The Anglo-Saxons, now converted and civilized, took the lead in the work of civilization among European nations. From them went forth St. Winifrid, or Boniface, as he is usually called, who became the Apostle of Germany, with a numerous host of apostolic companions. Alcuin was employed by Charlemagne, not only as his own tutor, but also to found schools in various parts of the Frankish Empire. Many other Anglo Saxon and Irish monks occupied chairs in these institutions.

In these schools and in the episcopal and monastic institutions we find the germs from which the great *Universities* of the Middle Ages have been gradually developed. When we look at the number of these great institutions, when we consider the multitude of students from all parts and of all classes who flocked to them, when we review the extensive course of studies which they pursued, when we behold those great lights who occupied their chairs, we must conclude that, in those ages which modern writers and talkers are pleased to call "dark," though illiteracy may have been more common, yet higher education was more universal and a good deal



more thorough and substantial than in our own enlightened age.<sup>1</sup> Whatever modern educationalists may think or say in disparagement of the mediæval system of education, we cannot induce ourselves to believe that institutions which turned out writers and thinkers like Albertus Magnus, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, Duns Scotus, Alexander of Hales, Roger Bacon and such polished geniuses as Dante, Petrarch, Chaucer or Sir Thomas More, have been inferior to our modern "cram" and high pressure universities with all their vaunted progress. Nor can the mediæval schools be despised for their ignorance in the natural sciences any more than Lord Bacon or Sir Isaac Newton can be blamed for not inventing the telephone or the electric light.

While higher education was thus provided for by the Church in the Middle Ages, the popular or primary schools were by no means neglected. About the year 1400, the diocese of Prague alone, which covered a comparatively limited territory, had at least 640 elementary schools. Now, taking this number as a basis for the 63 dioceses into which Germany was then divided and which were in great part more extensive and populous than Prague, we obtain more than 40,000 elementary schools in Germany alone. As the same discipline essentially prevailed with regard to schools throughout the Church, we might make a similar approximate calculation for the other countries. In the year 1378 we find 63 lay teachers occupied in elementary schools in the city of Paris, a very considerable number for the then existing population. Of these, 22 were female teachers, a circumstance which shows that the education of the female sex was then sufficiently provided for. The education of the female sex, however, was then, as it is now in the Church, wherever she is free, mainly in the hands of religious women. Every convent had its school for externs as well as for the members of its own community. Should any one wish further information on the high attainments of the ladies of the Middle Ages, we would refer him to Montalembert's brilliant chapter on the "Anglo-Saxon Nuns," in his interesting history of the *Monks of the West*.

We see, therefore, that the Church has from the beginning looked upon education as her province. She has practically educated the nations for 1800 years, and continues in the exercise of this minis-

---

<sup>1</sup> Before the so-called Reformation we count 66 European Catholic Universities of note, of which Italy possessed 17, Germany 14, France 12, Spain and Portugal 10, England 2, Scotland 3, Hungary 3, other countries 5. In the 14th century the University of Bologna numbered 13,000 students, while the University of Oxford (including fellows, tutors and students) formed a body of 30,000. The number of years devoted to study exclusive of the preparatory course was generally 7 for arts and 12 for professional branches (Theology, Medicine, Law), making in all at least 19 years of higher studies, or more in case of less than ordinary success.

try wherever she enjoys her liberty. She has received an inviolable charter from her divine Founder. She has founded the first schools in Christendom and gathered the élite of Christian genius to imbibe the pure waters of learning from their limpid sources. She preserved the remnants of ancient civilization from the devouring flames of barbaric invasion and the levelling fury of sectarian fanaticism. She has given birth to those great institutions of learning which will be remembered in history as the cradles of genius and seats of literature and the fine arts when all our modern public schools and universities will have glided into forgetfulness. From her bosom have gone forth the great teaching orders and congregations of both sexes, who, bound by the holy vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, untrammelled by all earthly ties, free from the clogging influences of worldly affections, devote themselves, whole and undivided, to the work of education. To-day, while her rights are violated by the machinations of godless states and still more godless secret sects; while her children are perfidiously enticed or violently driven into godless and irregular state schools, she shows her divine charter, and says, as the Apostles did, "*non possumus* ; we cannot yield, we cannot betray the charge of Christ ; let the little ones come to me."

The fact that the Church has from the very outset claimed and exercised the right of educating the Christian youth is a sufficient proof of the existence of such a right. Her rights may be violated. The youth may be wrested from her arms with brute force and driven into godless institutions. Concessions may be extorted from her, whereby, to prevent greater evils, she may yield a portion of her rights, provided only the principle be maintained. But the rights entrusted to her by her Divine Spouse she can never abandon, because they imply the most serious and binding duties. Let us now enter somewhat more minutely into those rights and duties, and try, as far as space permits, to determine their extent more in detail.

And for the first, we say : *The Church has the divinely constituted and inalienable right to provide for a complete religious education of all her children in all schools, of whatever kind or grade they may be.* By a *religious education* we do not mean the mere instruction in the Christian doctrine. This, though an essential element, does not constitute a religious education. A religious education supposes a knowledge of the Christian doctrine and consists mainly in a religious and moral training by the exercise of virtuous acts and all those practices of religion which, according to the principles of revelation, constitute or insure a Christian and supernatural life. This training the church owes to all her children, and she has an indisputable right, unmolested, to fulfil this duty through

her lawful ministers, under all circumstances and in all institutions—in the high-school and university, as well as in the elementary school.

This is manifest, first, from the duty which the Church has of directing the faithful by efficacious means to their supernatural end. With the exercise of this duty the Church cannot dispense at any instant of man's life, from the moment she has received him into her fold until she delivers him up to the Supreme Pastor, at the hour of his death. But towards no stage of life is this duty so strictly incumbent upon her as towards that of youth and childhood. "As the twig is bent the tree's inclined." She must, therefore, exercise the greatest vigilance, that, while the child and youth is growing, physically and intellectually, his moral and religious development may keep pace with his bodily and mental growth. She must take care that the germ of supernatural life, which is deposited in his soul in the Sacrament of Baptism, be nurtured and watered by instruction and appropriate devotional exercises, in order that it may take deep root and wax strong into supernatural maturity. She must guard that principle against the evil influences of false doctrines and demoralizing associations, lest it may be blasted in the bud. And should the supernatural seedling become extinct by the blighting breath of sin, she must restore it by the regenerating virtue of the sacraments. Such is the divine mission of the Church, such her indispensable duty. If then the Church has received this charge from her divine spouse, she surely has the right to fulfil it without let or hindrance. But it cannot be fulfilled without free access to the schools, without a perfect freedom in teaching the children, in assembling them to daily exercises of devotion and, at stated times, to the sacraments, without the means of assuring herself of the moral and religious tone of the schools, of exercising the necessary supervision, to prevent any thing being taught by word or example which might endanger the faith or morals of the children. Any institution which excludes the Church from those functions of education or obstructs her in their free exercise evidently violates her most sacred rights. That such an institution also infringes upon the natural rights of the individual, of the family, the parents and children, and tramples under foot the inborn claims of conscience, we have shown in our previous article.

Nor need the advocates of non-sectarian education point to the reading of the Scriptures without note or comment, or to the compensation of the Sunday-school. Abstracting from the fact that the reading of a disapproved version of the Scriptures will be against the convictions of a large fraction of the parents and children, no one will look upon such reading of the Scriptures, "without



note or comment," as part or portion of religious education, unless he indulge in the old-fashioned Protestant theory that the word of God acts immediately and directly on the soul by a quasi-inspiration. Nay, we are convinced that such mechanical reading and hearing of the Bible "without note or comment," in the schools, can only produce skepticism and generate contempt for the word of God in the minds of the children. The experiment has been so unsuccessful here in our own country that the practice is now all but abandoned in our public schools. The Sunday-school experiment, as far as non-Catholics are concerned in this country, has proved equally unsuccessful. This is evident from the complete disintegration of the Protestant sects, the gross ignorance in religious matters and the wide-spread religious indifference outside of the Catholic Church. How many of our go-to-meeting and Sunday-school young Americans know even those articles whose knowledge is absolutely necessary for salvation, to say nothing of the absolutely necessary means of salvation? Such is the drift at present, that, unless our public educational system is changed, we shall, in a few generations, have a nation of educated pagans, who will have retained of Christianity no more than a few conventional phrases. And how can it be otherwise if religion is ostracized from the schools and relegated into the Sunday-school as a branch of knowledge and education that is not worth caring for, that does not deserve a place in the ordinary life of the child or man, but is merely a matter of private interest and taste? Still less effectual will be the work of the Sunday-school, when, as is frequently the case, it is paralyzed during the week by the naturalistic or anti-Christian tone of the school and other demoralizing influences. So much has already been said and written on the influence of secular education on the Catholic youth, especially in our own country, that we prefer to pass it over in silence. The conviction has been brought home to every thinking Catholic, worthy of the name, that only a complete religious education, such as is given in Catholic schools, can preserve our children from the drift of infidelity and the deluge of immorality which a godless system of education has brought upon the country. Should the education be Christian, it is plain to all right-thinking Catholics that the schools must be Christian, that the children must move in a Christian atmosphere, not for one day in the week only, but all the year round. And this can be obtained only by the direct influence of the Church on the schools and their daily workings. If the child has an immortal soul to save, and his eternal weal or woe depends upon the issue of this affair of salvation, surely no less, but much more stress should be laid upon his training to success in this all-important business than to cleverness in the secular pursuits of life. If such

is the case, why should the Church, the divinely appointed organ instituted by God for the salvation of mankind, be excluded from the domain of education? Such an exclusion is a crying iniquity against God and man, manifesting either the grossest ignorance of the most elementary Christian maxims or the most inconceivable and fiendish malice.

But we go still farther and assert that the Church has not only the right to give a complete religious education to her children in all schools, but has also *the right of supervising the secular instruction, both literary and scientific*, at least so far as to assure herself that there is nothing either in the subject-matter taught or in the manner of conveying it which might endanger the faith or morals, or obstruct the moral and religious development, of the youth. This will appear a hard saying to the advocates of secular or unsectarian education. Yet it is only a corollary of the preceding principle. If the right of securing a complete religious education for her children can be claimed by the Church, also the right of employing the necessary means to this end must be conceded to her. A right to the end implies a right to the means. Now, who does not clearly see that all the efforts of the Church to give a Christian education would be frustrated if she had no control over the secular teaching? What will it avail the Church to teach religion to the children and inculcate its practice, if the secular teacher undoes her work by teaching and inculcating the contrary? What will it profit to teach the child that Christianity is a divine institution, if the secular teacher tells him that Christianity is a myth? What will it benefit to teach the child the history of the creation, the fall of man, and the redemption, if the secular teacher happens to be an evolutionist, and teaches that we descend, or, as some please to put it, "ascend" from the ape? What use will it be for the Church to inculcate morality, if the secular teacher denies the existence of a future retribution, or the immortality of the soul, and thus makes the lot of the just equal to that of the criminal, or puts man on the same level with the beast? In vain will the Church try to direct the child to a Christian life and to Christian virtue if, in his tenderest years, the most dangerous literature is thrown in his way, if even the school-books contain objectionable passages. And what if, as is not seldom the case, treatises on physiology are explained and illustrated to boys and girls, in their very childhood, in a way which is highly prejudicial to morality? What if the text-books of history and literature are teeming with calumny and slander against the Church and all her institutions and practices? Can the Church look on with indifference, or is she not bound to raise her voice, in protest, against such outrages done to her children, and seek redress of such grievances? But without exercising

a certain supervision over the secular teaching in the schools, the Church has no means of preventing such calamities or redressing them. Her ministers must, therefore, have free access to the schools. She must be free to examine into the subjects taught, the manner in which they are taught, and the instruments which are employed, especially the text-books. She must have the means of assuring herself of the orthodoxy and the good moral character of the teachers, and have the power of correcting and the possibility of removing them should this be necessary. She must satisfy herself that such discipline is maintained in the schools as to prevent perversion or immoral contagion among the pupils.

All this follows as a logical sequence from the duty and corresponding right which the Church has of providing for her children a full religious Christian education. Whoever believes at all in the divine mission of the Christian Church, be he Catholic or non-Catholic, must grant so much. Whoever denies the Church this right, manifests that the idea of a Church or a divine ministry does not enter into his creed. By the very fact that non-Catholic clergymen do not insist upon this right they but too clearly show that they have a very inferior notion of their ministry, and forcibly imply that, as far as they are concerned, their existence might, without any inconvenience, be dispensed with, and their places filled by the superintendent or the schoolma'am.

This right of supervision we vindicate for the Church in virtue of her divine mission in regard to all schools of every grade, from the kindergarten to the university, though not in the same degree. Preëminently she holds and exercises it towards *primary schools*. These latter have ever up to the present century been looked upon as ecclesiastical institutions (*annexum religionis*), and were wholly under the control of the Church. As such they have been considered by Protestants as well as Catholics. As such they have been acknowledged by the conventions of the various governments with the Holy See. As such they have been acknowledged in England, as far as the High Church is concerned, to this day, and the same rights, with some restrictions, are now extended to other denominations. Non-sectarian schools have so far been opened by the British Government only in default of the Churches; and though these public schools are growing in favor with some English politicians, yet the denominational schools meet with a fair share of justice on the part of the British Government at home and abroad.

The correctness of this view of the elementary schools is evident from the very nature of the case. The essential function of primary schools is religious education. For, if the child has religious faculties to be trained; if it has a soul to save and must learn the



necessary means to save it, both theoretically and practically; if it must learn to walk in the path of virtue and salvation in its tender years; surely this spiritual training is of more importance than the learning of the three R's and other more ornamental than useful "cram" with which the children in our times are afflicted. The three R's should be taught and all well taught; but (to speak as Christians) these are subordinate to the elements of religion at this early age. At this tender stage of life, the whole surroundings, the atmosphere in which the child moves, should be religious. The eyes should be chastened by the contemplation of pious objects; the ear should be trained to the melody of sacred song; the lips should be taught to lisp the holy names, the tiny hands to fold themselves in prayer, the whole person to compose itself to Christian modesty; the imagination should be stored with pious and chaste representations; the memory should become the treasury of holy recollections. The practice of religion should, at this age, be made sweet and easy by frequent and appropriate exercises of devotion. Oh, that teachers took half as much pains for the religious training of children as the godless kindergarten does for their secular drill! If they only employed even a fraction of those devices which modern pedagogues suggest to awaken the senses and the minds of the children to the observation of the phenomena of nature to fit them for the future pursuit of natural science! Yet, here we will not speak of methods. All we say is, that elementary education, being essentially religious, must consequently be mainly under the control of the Church. We do not deny the State its due share in the conduct of schools. It may put its claims within its own sphere, in regard to the secular results to be obtained; but the Church, being charged with what is essential in the education, must have the decisive vote and superintendence.

The Church must, therefore, claim the right of *erecting* elementary schools for the education of her children, and of *directing* the same, independently of all civil authority, though she is bound to listen and conform to the *just* wishes of the State, and especially of the parents, in things pertaining to the secular training. She must claim the right of *educating the teachers* of elementary schools, and, therefore, of erecting and conducting *normal schools*; for this is a necessary means of obtaining a staff of teachers who are not only qualified for secular instruction, but also fit to give a religious training by word and conduct. She must claim the right of *examining, approving, and inspecting* the teachers, to assure herself of their capacity and standing, at any given time, to ascertain whether she may safely continue her approbation, or be obliged in a given case to withdraw it. She must claim the right of *removing or exacting the removal* of such teachers as from moral or other

causes prove themselves unworthy or unfit for their office. These rights the Church has by divine institution. She cannot, or will not renounce them. They may be and have been violated by brute force; but this circumstance cannot change the fact or detract anything from the just claims of the Church. Against her divine rights there is no prescription possible.

We now pass from the elementary schools to those which are generally termed *middle schools*. Under this appellation we comprise all those educational institutions which lie between the elementary schools and the universities, properly so called. Their object is to prepare students, especially by a *literary* training, for the higher studies of philosophy and the professional branches of learning, theology, medicine, law, etc. This course of preparation, which generally covers a period of six or seven years (in Germany it is now extended to nine and ten years) formerly consisted mainly in the study of the Latin and Greek classics. These still maintain their place as the principal instrument of training in all well-organized institutions, while other branches, especially mathematics, science, history, modern languages, and literature, receive greater attention. The exigencies of our times have also created a separate class of middle schools, known in Europe as *polytechnical* or *real* schools, and in America as *high schools* and *special courses*. But these latter are generally little more than an appendage to the ordinary elementary schools, and must be treated by the Church in the same way, with slight modifications, which we cannot here define.

With regard to those middle schools which are really preparatory for the higher studies, their relations to the Church are not entirely so intimate. Such institutions are not *essentially* religious or ecclesiastical. Any individual or corporation endowed with the necessary qualifications may establish and conduct such a school, provided the laws and demands of the Church be complied with, and the full exercise of her rights be allowed. They are not considered in law as *annexa religionis*, as elementary schools are. Their immediate object is not religious but secular training, with a view to the pursuit of higher studies, whether sacred or profane. But while the mind is being formed with letters and science, the religious side of the character must be harmoniously developed, and that with the more care the greater are the dangers that beset the pursuit of letters, especially at that age when the passions are so strong and character so flexible, at that stage which is generally decisive for after-life. During this time the religious instruction as well as the secular has to be continued. The students must acquire a full and well-digested knowledge of the Christian doctrine. They must be kept up to the practice of their

religion, and guarded against the dangers attendant on youth. The Church must, then, enjoy full freedom to continue the religious education she began in the elementary schools, in the widest sense of the word. She must have a full insight into the interior workings of the schools, possess all the means to avert all dangers of corruption or perversion, whether these may arise from teachers or text-books, or method, or the discipline of the schools. But without the exercise of an efficacious supervision all this is impossible. Hence we conclude that though these institutions are not strictly religious, the Church should exercise nearly the same supervision over them as over the elementary schools. If such schools are founded and supported by the Church, it is plain that she has the exclusive control over them. All the State can justly demand in this case is the necessary qualifications in such of the students as present themselves for public offices. Where they have obtained these qualifications is not the business of civil authority to inquire. Should the institutions conducted by the Church, however, receive their support from the State, it would then have, at most, the right to examine into the results of the secular training by competent inspectors; unless in the case of strictly ecclesiastical schools, such as seminaries, which are exclusively under the control of the Church. But even though the direction is not in the hands of the Church, there remains for her at least the inviolable right of giving the pupils, as an essential part of their training, a complete religious education, and exercising such a supervision over the secular instruction and training as to have a sufficient guarantee for the security of faith and morals, and the necessary safeguard against the perversion of her children.

If we further apply these general principles to the *university*, the necessity of a similar supervision will be manifest. What is a university? Taking it in its general acceptation and as it presents itself to us historically, a university is an educational institution in which *all* the sciences which constitute a liberal and professional education are taught (*studium generale*). Now, if a university be such as to deserve that name, also religion or theology must be one of its faculties, and to teach religion or theology, as every one knows, is the province of the Church, as she alone has received this commission from the Divine Founder of Christianity. The Church must, therefore, be represented in a university and occupy that place which her dignity and the rank of that science which she represents require.

But even though a university, or what goes by that name, should profess only secular sciences and arts, such as medicine, law, philosophy, science, and letters, it cannot, therefore, exclude the influence of the Church. Secular sciences, too, have all their neces-



sary bearing upon religion and theology. Not one of them can dispense with the aid of theology. She must keep them in check within their proper boundary. If we wish to keep on the standpoint of revelation, she must say the last word on every subject. The teaching of reason and revelation, coming from the same divine source, can never be at variance with each other. The truths of revelation must, therefore, form certain landmarks within which reason must confine itself if it would not stray from the path of truth. As soon as it wanders outside these confines, without the guidance of theology, it is sure to err. But who has to define what *is* revealed truth and what *is not*? It is only the Church, to whom the deposit of faith has been consigned. To the Church, therefore, and her science must be subordinate every other science, inasmuch as she can assign them their proper sphere, check their vain curiosity, and bid them go "so far and no farther." The wild aberrations of science and scientists in our days prove to evidence the necessity of this control.

That the abandonment of science to its own resources leads not only to its own ruin but also to the overthrow of religion, is equally patent from daily experience. Where is the science to-day which does not glory in the mouth of the infidel of having dealt a deadly blow at religion? "Just as comparative anatomy, political economy, the philosophy of history, and the science of antiquities, may be and are turned against religion," says Cardinal Newman (*Idea of a University*), "by being taken for themselves [apart from theology], so a like mistake may befall any other. Grammar, for instance, does not at first sight appear to admit of a perversion; yet Horne Tooke made of it the vehicle of his peculiar skepticism. Law would seem to have enough to do with its own clients and their affairs, and yet Mr. Bentham made a treatise on judicial proofs a covert attack on the miracles of revelation. And in like manner physiology may deny moral evil and human responsibility; geology may deny Moses; and logic may deny the Holy Trinity; and other sciences now rising into notice are, or will be, victims of a similar abuse." It is an acknowledged fact that science, divorced from religion, is, and has always been, hostile to religion and productive of infidelity. To prevent this evil by the reconciliation and close alliance of both science and religion, is the duty and has always been the endeavor of the Church. Hence, she has always opposed herself to mere secular training in every department of education and every dominion of science. In no other respect, perhaps, has the Church shown the divine instinct of the Holy Ghost as in her wonderful foresight in this matter. Time has but too truly realized her dire forebodings on the effects of mere secular education. Her claims, therefore, to a place in the

higher institutions of learning, for her own defence and the benefit of science, must be admitted by all those who do not totally ignore the influence of Christianity on the intellectual life of individuals and nations.

Nor can the Church renounce her claims. She has been entrusted with the deposit of faith by Jesus Christ, her Spouse. It is her mission and duty not only to teach the true faith to the nations, but also to defend it and preserve it in the hearts of peoples and individuals. But as the faith is nowhere more endangered than in institutions of learning which have broken off all connection with the Church and cast away the restraint of revelation, the Church must employ all means to obviate such an evil by maintaining and exercising her right of supervision; and as this right is, as we have shown, a divine prerogative, no temporal power can violate it without committing a flagrant outrage against God and His Church. If the Church holds her proper place in a well-organized university representing the sacred science, all extravagances and encroachments on the part of the profane departments and their representatives can be easily prevented. The tone of the whole institution will be Christian, and the salutary influence of Christianity will spontaneously make itself felt in all departments without much direct interference. In any case, however, the least the Church can demand of a Christian university is orthodoxy and a good moral character in directors, teachers, and other officials; Christian discipline and the exclusion of all elements dangerous to faith and morals, and, finally, a perfect freedom in the exercise of her saving ministries within the institution. The Church can never approve of an educational institution which denies her these prerogatives. Nor can she permit her children to frequent them; unless, indeed, in the case in which other institutions are not available, and *then only* when the danger of perversion is remote, and special precautions are taken to counteract the pernicious influence of an exclusively secular training.

We here speak of the "Church" and a "Christian university" in the very widest sense. For all denominations, who profess to be Christian, must make these same demands, provided they believe in Christianity as a divine institution, which is not only a medium of salvation for mankind, but the most powerful agent of civilization and culture. They practically ignore the divine mission and the civilizing influence of Christianity who would in any way subordinate its functions to other than the God-appointed authority. If the gentlemen in the ministry, outside the Catholic Church, were strongly impressed with the belief that they were called to minister to the faithful in the "things that appertain to God," they would very soon see, as we do, that their first duty is

to preserve the Christian faith in the people by making education religious in the various grades of educational institutions.

The attitude of the Catholic Church towards State education has been often clearly and forcibly set forth, as well by the bishops who have been "set by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God" as by the Sovereign Pontiff, her Supreme Head. As long as the Church was in the undisturbed possession of her rights, there was little controversy on the subject. She quietly exercised the function of Christian training on every field of education. She insisted in her synods on the multiplication of schools of the various grades, especially popular schools. But as soon as the controversy arose, her bishops all over the world did not fail, singly and in synod assembled, to proclaim aloud those rights which we have just been vindicating, to condemn Godless schools in the strongest terms, to exhort the faithful to keep their children aloof from those seminaries of infidelity and consequent immorality, and, where necessary, to erect and support their own schools. Space is wanting to quote even a selection of their valuable, beautiful, and zeal-inspiring utterances. We can only refer the reader to Father Jenkins's excellent work, or the voluminous and useful *Collectio Lacensis*. Such is the unanimity of the "judges of the faith" in condemnation of the Godless school system that it undoubtedly constitutes a *consensus*, which no Catholic can oppose without incurring shipwreck in the faith.

We may be permitted, however, here to translate a few utterances of the Holy See, even at the risk of repeating what is already known to many of our readers. In a *brief* addressed to Herman von Vicari, Archbishop of Friburg, Baden, July 14th, 1864, Pius IX., after reviewing the dangers of Godless schools in general, expresses himself concerning the common or primary schools as follows: "As common schools have been instituted mainly for the religious education of the people, to cherish Christian piety and morality, they have, therefore, always deservedly and with perfect right claimed the whole care, solicitude and watchfulness of the Church above all other educational institutions. And, therefore, the designs and endeavors of excluding the Church's authority from the common schools proceed from a most hostile disposition to the Church and from the desire of extinguishing the Divine light of holy faith in the nations. Wherefore the Church, which first founded those schools, has always bestowed the greatest care and zeal upon them and considered them as the most important department of her authority and jurisdiction; and any separation of them from the Church cannot but be productive of the greatest loss to the Church and to the schools themselves. All those who would have the Church resign or withdraw her salutary direction



of the popular schools demand nothing less than that the Church should act against the behests of the Divine Founder, and neglect the most important charge committed to her of procuring the salvation of men. Assuredly, in whatever places or countries these most dangerous schemes of excluding the authority of the Church from the schools should be attempted or put into execution, and the youth should be lamentably exposed to the danger of suffering loss in their faith, the Church is *not only* bound to use all her zeal and efforts, and spare no pains at any time that the young should receive the necessary religious education, *but* is also bound to admonish all the faithful and *declare to them that such schools, being hostile to the Catholic Church, cannot in conscience be frequented.*"

The Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition, in the detailed Instruction to the Bishops of the United States concerning the *public schools*, June 30th, 1875, after quoting the last sentence of the above citation, adds the following words: "These words, inasmuch as they are based on the natural and Divine law, enunciate a general principle, which holds universally and refers to all plans where this most destructive system has been unfortunately introduced. It is, therefore, necessary that the illustrious prelates should, by all possible means, keep the flock entrusted to their charge aloof from the corrupting influence of the *public schools*. In the opinion of all, nothing is so necessary for this end as that Catholics should everywhere have their own schools, and these not inferior to the public schools. Every effort must, therefore, be made to erect Catholic schools where such do not exist, or to enlarge them and make them more useful and efficient, that in the course and method of training they may be nowise inferior to the public schools."

The Sacred Congregation grants that there may be circumstances in which Catholic parents may, in conscience, send their children to American *public schools*, viz.: when no Catholic school is at hand, or when that which is at "hand is not fit to give the children an education suited to their station and conformable to their age." It is to be remembered, however, that the frequenting of the public schools can be permitted, even in these cases, according to the declaration of the Sacred Congregation, only when the danger of perversion can be rendered *remote*; and that *the decision is left to the Bishop*, not to the parents or children.

These utterances of the Holy See refer especially to the common or elementary school. The following propositions, condemned in the *Syllabus*, December 8th, 1864, are quite universal, and apply to all schools, of whatever grade:

*Proposition 45.* "The entire direction of the public schools in which the youth of a Christian State is educated, diocesan seminaries to a certain extent excepted, can and must be apportioned to

the civil authority, and that in such a way that no other authority has the right to interfere in the discipline of the schools, the direction of the studies, the conferring of degrees, or the choice and approbation of the teachers."

*Proposition 47.* "The most perfect state of civil society requires that the common schools which are open to the children of all classes of the people, and the public institutions in general which are destined for teaching letters and the exact sciences, and educating the youth, should be exempted from the authority, direction and interference of the Church, and be subjected to the absolute power of civil authority, at the direction of the rulers of the State and according to the manner of prevailing public opinion."

*Proposition 48.* "Catholic men may approve that system of education of youth which is separated from Catholic faith and the power of the Church, and which regards only, or, at least, chiefly, the natural sciences and the field of social life on earth."

From the doctrine condemned in these *theses* it follows:

1. That the State has not absolute power over the schools. In other words, they are not and cannot be mere State institutions, under the sole direction of civil authority.

2. That there can be no legitimate plea for exempting the schools from the authority of the Church, whether they are mere elementary schools or literary and scientific.

3. That no Catholic can connive at a system of education which has divorced itself from the authority of the Church and the Catholic faith, and has for its object, solely or mainly, natural or secular training.<sup>1</sup>

Such is the doctrine of the supreme teaching-office of the Church on secular public schools. Whence the reader may conclude in what light those so-called Catholics are to be considered who tell us that the public schools are as good as any else, and that neither they themselves nor their children have ever taken any harm from them.

But some one may say that these utterances of the Holy See are not *ex cathedra*, that they are consequently not infallible, and that we may think what we please of them. Such statements in any case would be highly irreverent to the authority of the Church, to say

---

<sup>1</sup> We did not deem it necessary to subject the right of educating the *clergy* to any special treatment, as it is sufficiently evident to all Catholics that this right belongs exclusively to the Church. The forty-sixth proposition of the *Syllabus*, which runs thus: "Imo in ipsis clericorum seminariis methodus studiorum adhibenda civili auctoritati subijcitur," excludes all right of interference on the part of the State. See Pius the Ninth's letter to the Archbishop of Munich, March 23d, 1865. The pending transactions between Berlin and the Vatican show how uncompromising the Church is on this point.

the least; but in the case before us we think that they would not be far short of heretical. For, granting that these are not *ex cathedra* pronouncements, they still partake of absolute infallibility from the universal consent of the bishops of the whole Catholic world, who, though dispersed, when *unanimously agreeing* with the Supreme Head of the Church and with one another on any point of doctrine, are *infallible judges of the faith*. Such, in our opinion, is the unanimity of the whole body of the Episcopate on these general principles that they are no less infallible than the decrees of the Vatican.

In no country is this *consensus* more manifest than in our own. There is, we believe, hardly a bishop living to-day in the United States who has not condemned the *existing* system of public schools in the strongest terms, and earnestly exhorted the clergy and the faithful entrusted to his charge to provide for Catholic schools for the education of the Catholic youth. Much has been done already in this direction in a comparatively short time, and much more is justly anticipated in the near future. The bishops shortly to assemble in Plenary Council, with Apostolic zeal and prudence combined, and the additional experience, deliberation and prayer of years, will deal with the question under its more practical aspects. If we have only done something to throw light on the more general principles and to contribute to a more correct and healthy public opinion on the subject, we have amply attained the object of these articles.

---



## THE NECESSITY OF RELIGION FOR SOCIETY.

1. *Religion the Basis of Civil Society.*
2. *The Religious Element in our American Civilization.*
3. *The Dangers that Threaten our American Civilization.*

## I.

## RELIGION THE BASIS OF CIVIL SOCIETY.

RELIGION is the bond that unites man with his Creator. It is a virtue by which due honor and worship are paid to God. The virtue of religion embraces all those fundamental truths that involve God's sovereignty over us and our entire dependence on Him. I employ the term *religion* here in its broadest and most comprehensive sense, as embodying the existence of God; His infinite power and knowledge; His providence over us; the recognition of a divine law; the moral freedom and responsibility of man; the distinction between good and evil; the duty of rendering our homage to God, and justice and charity to our neighbor; and, finally, the existence of a future state of rewards and punishments.

I hold that religion is the only solid basis of society. If the social edifice rests not on this eternal and immutable foundation, it will soon crumble to pieces. It would be as vain to attempt to establish society without religion as to erect a palace in the air, or on shifting sands, or to hope to reap a crop from seed scattered on the ocean's surface. Religion is to society what cement is to the building; it makes all parts compact and coherent. "He who destroys religion," says Plato, "overthrows the foundations of human society."<sup>1</sup>

The social body is composed of individuals who have constant relations with one another; and the very life and preservation of society demand that the members of the community discharge toward one another various and complex duties.

What does society require of your rulers and magistrates? What does it require of you? It demands of your rulers that they dispense justice with an even hand. It demands of you that you be loyal to your country, zealous in her defence, faithful in the observance of her law, conscientious in the payment of imposts and taxes for her maintenance and support. It demands that you be

---

<sup>1</sup> Lib. x., De Legibus.

scrupulous in observing your oaths and vows, just in the fulfilment of your contracts and obligations, honest in your dealings, and truthful in your promises. It demands that you honor and respect your lawful superiors, that you be courteous toward your equals, condescending to your inferiors, faithful to your friends, magnanimous to your enemies, and merciful to the poor and the oppressed. It demands of the married couple conjugal fidelity, of parents provident vigilance, of children filial love. In a word, it demands that you "render to all men their dues; tribute, to whom tribute is due; custom, to whom custom; fear, to whom fear; honor, to whom honor;"<sup>1</sup> and that you "render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's."<sup>2</sup>

How can these social virtues be practised without sufficient motives? These motives must be strong and powerful, because you have passions and self-interest to overcome. They must be universal, because they are binding on all members of society. They must be permanent, because they apply to all times and places.

What motives, religion apart, are forcible enough to compel legislators, rulers, and magistrates to be equitable and impartial in their decisions? What guarantee have we that they will not be biassed by prejudice and self-interest? Will a thirst for fame and a desire for public approbation prove a sufficient incentive for them to do right? How often has not this very love of glory and esteem impelled them to trample on the rights and liberties of the many, in order to win the approbation of a few sycophants, just as Roboam oppressed his subjects that he might be admired and praised by his young courtiers, and as Alexander enslaved nations to receive the applause of the fickle Athenians.

Would you vote for a presidential candidate that avowed atheistic principles? I am sure you would not. You would instinctively mistrust him; for an unbelieving president would ignore the eternal laws of justice, and the eternal laws of justice are the basis of civil legislation.

What principles without religion are binding enough to exact of you that obedience which you owe to society and to the laws of your country? Is it the dread of civil punishment? But the civil power takes cognizance only of overt acts. It has no jurisdiction over the heart, which is the seat of rebellion, the secret council-chamber where dark schemes are concocted. The civil power cannot enter the hidden recesses of the soul, and quell the tumults raging there. It cannot invade the domestic circle to expel the intemperance and lewdness that enervate and debauch both mind and body. It cannot suppress those base calumnies, whispered in

<sup>1</sup> Rom. xiii., 7.

<sup>2</sup> Mark xii., 17.

the dark, which poison the social atmosphere with their foul breath, and breed hatred, resentment, and death. You might as well expect to preserve a tree from decay by lopping off a few withered branches whilst allowing the worms to gnaw at the roots, as to preserve the social tree from moral corruption by preventing some external crimes whilst leaving the heart to be worm-eaten by vice.

Besides, if you are so disposed, can you not in many instances escape the meshes of the law by resorting to gifts, bribes, and ingenious frauds?

If the civil sword, even with the aid of religion, can scarcely restrain public disorders, how futile would be the attempt to do so without the coöperation of moral and religious influence!

Still less do you fear the judgment that posterity may pronounce on your conduct. For if you believe neither in God nor in a life to come, the condemnation of after-ages will not disquiet you, the censures of future generations will not disturb your ashes reposing in the tomb.

Nor can you suppose the emoluments of office an adequate incentive to induce you to be an upright and law-abiding member of society. The emoluments of office are reserved for the privileged few; the great bulk of society will always be consigned to private life.

Do not imagine, because you happen to be a man of irreproachable private life, integrity of character, and incorruptible justice, that your fellow-citizens will seek you out, as the Romans sought Cincinnatus at the plow, that they will cordially embrace you, force you from your cherished seclusion, and bestow upon you some office of trust and distinction.

"The office should seek the man, not the man the office," is a beautiful, but Utopian maxim,—a maxim so antiquated as to deserve a place in the cabinet of national curiosities. The most successful office-holder usually has been and usually will be the most industrious office-seeker; and his chances for success are not always improved by a delicate sense of honor and an inflexible adhesion to principle.

The esteem of your fellow-men will not be a sufficient inducement to make you a virtuous citizen; for the great mass of virtues, even of those virtues that influence the well-being of society, are practised in private, and are hidden from the eyes of men, like the root which gives life and bloom to the tree, or the gentle dew of heaven which silently sheds its blessings on the labors of the husbandman.

Nor should you be surprised if your good actions, instead of winning the applause of your fellow-citizens, will sometimes even



draw upon you their suspicion, their jealousy, their odium, and their calumny. The wisdom and integrity of Aristides were such that the Athenians surnamed him "The Just;" yet they condemned him to exile. On the day on which the people were to vote upon the question of his banishment, an illiterate burgher, who did not know him personally, requested him to write the name of *Aristides* upon his ballot. "Has that man done you any injury?" asked Aristides. "No," answered the other, "nor do I even know him. But I am tired of hearing him everywhere called 'The Just.'"

The case of the Founder of the Christian religion is still more familiar to the reader. Who was so great a benefactor to society as He? He went about doing good to all men. He gave sight to the blind, and hearing to the deaf, and walking to the lame, and strength to the paralyzed limb, and comfort to the afflicted, and even life to the dead. He promulgated the most sublime and beneficent laws that were ever given to man, He invariably inculcated respect for ruling powers and obedience to their authority; and yet He was branded as a seditious man, an enemy of Cæsar, and He was put to death by the very people whom He sought to deliver from spiritual bondage.

But, perhaps, you will say that a natural sense of justice, independently of religion, can exercise sufficient influence in inducing you to practise the duties of an upright citizen. They that discard religion and yet profess to believe in natural justice, are self-contradictory. They are grasping at the shadow, and rejecting the substance. They are unconsciously clothing themselves in the garment of religion, whilst they reject its spirit, "having, indeed, an appearance of godliness, but denying the power thereof."<sup>1</sup> If they had seriously reflected, they would discover that natural justice has no solid foundation unless it rests on religion. Natural justice may sound well in theory, but it is a feeble barrier against the encroachments of vice.

Tell me, what becomes of your natural love of justice, or what influence does it exert on your conduct, when it stands in the way of your personal interests, pleasures, and ambition?

It is swept away like a mud-bank before the torrent, because it has not the strong wall of religion to support it.

Would your love of justice lead you to give a righteous decision against your friend and in favor of a stranger, though you were persuaded that such a decision would convert your friend into a life-long enemy? Would it prompt you to disgorge ill-gotten wealth, and thus to fall in a single day from affluence into poverty? Would your natural sense of duty inspire you with pa-

---

<sup>1</sup> II. Tim., iii., 5.

tience and resignation, if you were defrauded of your property by the treachery of a friend? Would a mere natural sense of duty or propriety restrain a Joseph or a Susanna from defiling his or her conscience, and violating the sacred laws of marriage? Would a natural love of truth and honor compel a guilty man to avow his secret crime, that he might vindicate the innocent falsely accused? Such acts of justice, patience, and truth are not uncommon in the Christian dispensation; but they would have been deemed prodigies of virtue in Pagan times.

There are many that consider mental culture a panacea for every moral disorder. "Let knowledge," they say, "be diffused over the land. Social order and morality will follow in its track."

The experience of other nations, as well as that of our own, shows it a very great illusion to suppose that intellectual development is sufficient of itself to make us virtuous men, or that the moral status of a people is to be estimated by the widespread diffusion of purely secular knowledge.

When the Roman Empire had reached the highest degree of mental culture, it was sunk in the lowest depths of vice and corruption. The Persian Empire, according to the testimony of Plato, perished on account of the vicious education of its princes. While their minds were filled with knowledge, they were guided by no religious influences. The voice of conscience was drowned amid the more eager and captivating cries of passion, and they grew up monsters of lust, rapine, and oppression, governed by no law save the instincts of their brutal nature.

It does not appear that vice recedes in the United States in proportion as public education advances. Statistics, I fear, would go far to prove the contrary fact. The newspapers published in our large cities, are every day filled with startling accounts of deep-laid schemes of burglary, bank defalcations, premeditated murders, and acts of refined licentiousness. These enormities are perpetrated for the most part, not by unlettered criminals, but by individuals of consummate address and skill; they betray a well-disciplined mind uncontrolled by morality and religion. How true are the words of Kempis: "Sublime words make not a man holy and just, but a virtuous life maketh him dear to God."

If neither the vengeance of the civil power, nor the hope of emoluments, nor the esteem of your fellow-men, nor the natural love of justice, nor the influence of education and culture, nor all these motives combined, can suffice to maintain peace and order in society, where shall we find an adequate incentive to exact of us a loyal obedience to the laws of the country? This incentive is found only in religious principles. Religion, I maintain, is the only sure and solid basis of society. Convince me of the exist-

ence of a Divine Legislator, the Supreme Source of all law, by whom "Kings reign, and lawgivers decree just things;"<sup>1</sup> convince me of the truth of the Apostolic declaration that "there is no power but from God, and *that* those that are are ordained of God, and *that*, therefore, he who resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God;" convince me that there is a Providence, who seeth my thoughts as well as my actions, that there is an incorruptible Judge, who cannot be bought with bribes nor blinded by deceit, who has no respect of persons, who will render to every man according to his works, who will punish transgressions and reward virtue in the life to come; convince me that I am endowed with free-will and the power of observing or of violating the laws of the country,—and then you place before me a Monitor, who impels me to virtue without regard to earthly emoluments or human applause, and who restrains me from vice without regard to civil penalties, you set before my conscience a living Witness, who pursues me in darkness and in light, and in the sanctuary of home, as well as in the arena of public life.

Religion teaches me that we are all children of the same Father, brothers and sisters of the same Redeemer, and, consequently, members of the same family. It teaches me the brotherhood<sup>1</sup> of humanity.

Religion, therefore, is the fostering mother of charity, and charity is the guardian of civility and good-breeding, and good-breeding is one of the essential elements of the well-being of society. Worldly politeness, devoid of religion, is cold, formal, and heartless; it soon degenerates into hollow ceremony. Good-breeding, inspired by religion and charity, inculcates a constant self-denial. It is sincere and unaffected, it has the ring of the genuine coin, it passes current everywhere, and it is easily distinguished from the counterfeit article. A stranger, who would feel oppressed by the rigid mannerism which rules in the salons of Paris, would be charmed by the quiet dignity and genial warmth with which he would be received by the simple and religious people of the Tyrolese mountains.

As the air of heaven ascends the highest mountains and descends into the deepest valleys, vivifying the face of nature, so does the Christian religion permeate every stratum of society, purifying and invigorating the moral atmosphere. It influences the master and the servant, the rich and the poor. It admonishes the master to be kind and humane toward his servant by reminding him that he, also, has a Master in heaven who has no respect to persons. It does not attempt to disturb, still less to dissolve, those relations that exist between master and man; but it renders those relations

---

<sup>1</sup> Prov., viii., 15.



more harmonious by rebuking a domineering spirit. It admonishes the servant to be docile and obedient to his master; "not serving to the eye as it were pleasing men, but, as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart."<sup>1</sup>

It reminds him that true dignity is compatible with the most menial offices, and is forfeited only by the bondage of sin.

It charges the rich not to be high-minded, nor to trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who "giveth us abundantly all things to enjoy."<sup>2</sup> It counsels the poor to bear their privations with resignation, by setting before them the life of Him who, in the words of the Apostle, "being rich, became poor for your sake, that, through His poverty, you might be rich."<sup>3</sup>

In a word, religion is anterior to society and more enduring than governments; it is the focus of all social virtues, the basis of public morals, the most powerful instrument in the hands of legislators; it is stronger than self-interest, more awe-inspiring than civil threats, more universal than honor, more active than love of country,—the surest guarantee that rulers can have of the fidelity of their subjects, and that subjects can have of the justice of their rulers; it is the curb of the mighty, the defence of the weak, the consolation of the afflicted, the covenant of God with man; and, in the language of Homer, it is "the golden chain which suspends the earth from the throne of the eternal."

Every philosopher and statesman who has discussed the subject of human governments has acknowledged that there can be no stable society without justice, no justice without morality, no morality without religion, no religion without God. "It is an incontrovertible truth," observes Plato, "that if God presides not over the establishment of a city, and if it has only a human foundation, it cannot escape the greatest calamities. . . . If a State is founded on impiety and governed by men who trample on justice, it has no means of security."<sup>4</sup>

The Royal Prophet, long before Plato, had uttered the same sentiment: "Unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it. Unless the Lord keep the city, he watcheth in vain that keepeth it."<sup>5</sup> And Isaiah says: "The nation and the kingdom that will not serve Thee shall perish."<sup>6</sup>

Xenophon declares that "those cities and nations which are the most devoted to divine worship have always been the most durable and the most wisely governed, as the most religious ages have been the most distinguished for genius."<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Eph., vi., 6.

<sup>2</sup> II. Cor., viii., 9.

<sup>3</sup> Ps. cxxvi., 1.

<sup>7</sup> Memor. Socrat.

<sup>2</sup> I. Tim., vi., 17.

<sup>4</sup> De Leg., tom. viii.

<sup>6</sup> Isaiah, lx., 12.

"If you find a people without religion," says Hume, "rest assured that they do not differ much from the brute beasts."

"Never," says Rousseau, who had his lucid intervals of strong sense, "never was a state founded that did not have religion for its basis."<sup>2</sup>

Machiavel, who was not an extremist in piety, avows that good order is inseparable from religion. He brands the enemies of religion as "infamous and detestable men, destroyers of kingdoms and republics, enemies of letters and of all the arts that do honor to the human race and contribute to its prosperity."<sup>3</sup>

Even Voltaire admits that "it is absolutely necessary for princes and people, that the idea of a Supreme Being, Creator, Governor, Rewarder, and Avenger, should be deeply engraved on the mind."<sup>4</sup>

Legislators and founders of empires have been so profoundly impressed with the necessity of religion as the only enduring basis of social order, that they have always built upon it the framework of their constitution. This truth must be affirmed of Pagan as well as of Jewish and Christian legislators. Solon of Athens, Lycurgus of Lacedæmon, and Numa of ancient Rome, made religion the corner-stone of the social fabric which they raised in their respective countries.

So long as the old Romans adhered to the religious policy of Numa, their commonwealth flourished, the laws were observed, their rulers governed with moderation and justice, and the people were distinguished by a simplicity of manners, a loyalty to their sovereign, a patient industry, a quiet contentment, a spirit of patriotism, courage, and sobriety which have commanded the admiration of posterity. "The vessel of state was held in the storm by two anchors, religion and morality."<sup>5</sup>

It must be observed, however, that these virtues were too often marred by harshness, cruelty, ambition, and other vices, which were grave defects when weighed by the standard of the gospel. But a righteous God, who judges nations by the light that is given them, did not fail to requite the Romans for the civic virtues which they practised, guided solely by the light of reason. The natural virtues they exhibited were rewarded by temporal blessings, and especially by the great endurance of their republic.<sup>6</sup>

Montesquieu traces the downfall of Rome to the doctrines of Epicurianism, which broke down the barrier of religion and gave free scope to the sea of human passions.

<sup>1</sup> Natural History of Religion. (Not having the original at hand, I quote from a French translation.)

<sup>2</sup> Contrat Social., l. iv., ch. viii.

<sup>3</sup> Diction. Philos., art. Athéisme.

<sup>4</sup> *Cfr.* St. Augustine's City of God, bk. v., ch. 15.

<sup>5</sup> L. i., De' Discorsi.

<sup>6</sup> Esprit des Lois, l. viii.

Lust of power and of wealth, unbridled licentiousness, and the obscenities of the plays, corrupted the morals of the people. The master had unlimited power over his slaves. The debtor was at the mercy of his creditors. The father had the power of life and death over his children. The female sex was degraded, and the sanctuary of home desecrated by divorce. The poison that infected the individual invaded the family, and soon spread through every artery of the social body.

Toward the close of the last century, an attempt was made by Atheists in France to establish a government on the ruins of religion, and it is well known how signally they failed. The Christian Sabbath and festivals were abolished, and the churches closed. The only tolerated temple of worship was the criminal court, from which justice and mercy were inexorably banished, and where the judge sat only to condemn. The only divinity recognized by the apostles of anarchy was the goddess of reason; their high priests were the executioners; the victims of sacrifice were unoffending citizens; the altar was the scaffold; their hymns were ribald songs; and their worship was lust, rapine, and bloodshed.

The more exalted the rank, the more sacred the profession, the more innocent the accused, the more eagerly did the despots of the hour thirst for their blood. They recognized no liberty but their own license, no law but their own wanton and capricious humor, no conscience but their own insatiate malice, no justice but the guillotine. At last, when the country was soaked with blood, suspicion and terror seized the tyrants themselves, and the executioner of to-day became the victim of to-morrow.

In a few months, as De Lamennais says: "They accumulated more ruin than an army of Tartars could have left after a six years' invasion."<sup>1</sup> They succeeded in a few weeks in demolishing the social fabric which had existed for thirteen centuries.

## II.

### THE RELIGIOUS ELEMENT IN OUR AMERICAN CIVILIZATION.

The subject treated in the foregoing section would not be adequately discussed unless some application of it be made to our own country. It may be interesting and instructive for us to consider in this place whether the dictum of the Holy Scripture, "Righteousness exalteth a nation,"<sup>2</sup> is as applicable to the United States as it has been to ancient empires; whether the founders of our government and their successors, down to our time, have been

<sup>1</sup> *Essai sur l'Indifférence*, p. 431.

<sup>2</sup> Proverbs, xiv., 34.



indebted to religion as an indispensable element for establishing and maintaining the republic on a solid basis; what blessings we owe to our Christian civilization; and what dangers are to be averted that the Commonwealth may be perpetuated.

At first sight it might seem that religious principles were entirely ignored by the Fathers of the Republic in framing the Constitution, as it contains no reference to God, and makes no appeal to religion. It is true, indeed, that the Constitution of the United States does not once mention the name of God. And even the first article of the amendments declares, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." And so strongly have certain religious sects been impressed with this fact, that they have repeatedly tried to get the name of God incorporated into the Constitution.

But the omission of God's holy name affords no just criterion of the religious character of the Founders of the Republic or of the Constitution which they framed. Nor should we have any concern to have the name of God imprinted in the Constitution, so long as the Constitution itself is interpreted by the light of Christian Revelation. I would rather sail under the guidance of a living captain than under that of a figure-head at the prow of a ship. The adorable name of God should not be a mere figure-head adorning the pages of the Constitution. Far better for the nation that His Spirit should animate our laws, that He should be invoked in our courts of justice, that He should be worshipped in our Sabbaths and thanksgivings, and that His guidance should be implored in the opening of our Congressional proceedings.

The Declaration of American Independence is one of the most solemn and memorable professions of political faith that ever emanated from the leading minds of any country. It has exerted as much influence in foreshadowing the spirit and character of our Constitution and public policy as the Magna Charta exercised on the Constitution of Great Britain. A devout recognition of God and of His overruling providence pervades that momentous document from beginning to end. God's holy name greets us in the opening paragraph, and is piously invoked in the last sentence of the Declaration; and thus it is at the same time the corner-stone and the keystone of this great monument to freedom.

The illustrious signers declared that "when, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands that have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature *and of nature's God* entitle them, a decent respect for the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes that impel them to the separation."

They acknowledge one Creator, the source of life, of liberty, and of happiness. They "appeal to the Supreme Judge of the world" for the rectitude of their intentions, and they conclude in this solemn language: "For the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

The laws of the United States are so intimately interwoven with the Christian religion that they cannot be adequately expounded without the light of Revelation. The common law of this country is derived from the common law of Great Britain. "The common law," says Kent, "is the common jurisprudence of the people of the United States, and was brought with them as colonists from England, and established here, *so far* as it was adapted to our institutions and circumstances. It was claimed by the Congress of the United Colonies, in 1774, as a branch of those 'indubitable rights and liberties to which the Colonies are entitled.' . . . Its principles may be compared to the influence of the liberal arts and sciences: 'Adversis perfugium ac solatium præbent; delectant domi; non impediunt foris; pernoctant nobiscum, peregrinantur, rusticantur.' To use the words of Duponceau: 'We live in the midst of the common law; we inhale it at every breath, imbibe it at every pore; we meet with it when we awake and when we lie down to sleep, when we travel and when we stay at home, and it is interwoven with the very idiom that we speak.'"<sup>1</sup>

Now, it is an incontrovertible fact that the common law of England is, to a great extent, founded on the principles of Christian ethics; the maxims of the Holy Scripture form the great criterion of right and wrong in the civil courts. Hence blasphemy and perjury are punished as crimes against the commonwealth, *because* they are crimes against religion. The Chancellors of England, who were "the keepers of the king's conscience," have ever been, for succeeding generations, professing Christians, and, until the Reformation, they were even churchmen.

"The best features of the common law," says an American juriconsult, "if not derived from, have at least been improved and strengthened by, the prevailing religion and the teachings of the Sacred Book, especially those that regard the family and social relations." The Church left the impress of the Divine Law so indelibly on the common law that Sir M. Hale was moved to assert that Christianity was a part of the laws of England, and that to reproach the Christian religion "was to speak in subversion of the law," and that it was the judgment of the English people and their

---

<sup>1</sup> Commentaries, p. 336 *et seq.*

tribunals that "he who reviled, subverted and ridiculed Christianity did an act which struck at the foundation of civil society."

The oath that is taken by the President of the United States before he assumes the duties of his office, and that is administered in our courts of justice, not only to the witnesses, but also to the judge, jury, lawyers, and officers of the court, in accordance with the Constitution, implies a belief in God and forms an act of religious worship. It is a national tribute of homage to the universal sovereignty of our Creator. By the act of taking an oath a man makes a profession of faith in God's unfailing truth, absolute knowledge, and infinite sanctity. He also acknowledges God as Supreme Judge, who, in the life to come, will reward righteousness and punish iniquity.

The Bible, which is placed in the hands of the witness and is reverently kissed, involves a recognition of divine Revelation.

The Christian Sabbath is revered as a day of rest and public prayer throughout the land. The halls of Congress and of our State legislatures are closed on that day. The proceedings of our courts of justice—Federal, State, and municipal—are suspended. The din of commerce is hushed; the looms in our factories are silent; the fires burn low in our foundries; and every city, town, and hamlet resounds with the peal of the joyous bell inviting men to prayer. This is a national homage to the Christian religion.

Again, the Chief Magistrate of the nation and the Governors of the States issue their annual proclamations, inviting the people to offer their thanksgiving to "the Giver of all good gifts" for the blessings He has vouchsafed to the land.

There is another national custom which proclaims God's sovereignty and superintending providence. I refer to the practice prevailing in this country of opening the proceedings of Congress and of State legislatures, of inaugurating other important measures with prayer, and of invoking the blessing of God on the work about to be commenced.

I do not pretend to excuse or palliate the bad taste and irreverent familiarity which characterize some of those prayers. But the holiest practices may be perverted. And I cannot fail to express my admiration for a custom which, in principle, recognizes God's mercy and moral government, and which confides in Him as the Fountain of all light and wisdom.

The original settlers of the American colonies, with very rare individual exceptions, were all professing Christians, who inaugurated and fostered that Christian legislation and those religious customs to which I have referred.

The Puritans who founded New England, the Dutch who settled in New York, the Quakers and Irish who established themselves in



Pennsylvania, the Swedes in Delaware, the English Catholics who colonized Maryland, the English Episcopalians who colonized Virginia, Georgia, and North Carolina, the Irish Presbyterians who also emigrated to the last-named State, the French Huguenots and the English colonists who planted themselves in South Carolina, the French and Spanish who took possession of Louisiana and Florida—all these colonists made an open profession of Christianity in one form or another, and recognized religion as the basis of society.

The same remark applies with equal truth to that stream of population which, from the beginning of the present century, has been constantly flowing into this country from Ireland and Germany and extending itself over the entire land.

In one century we have grown from three millions to fifty-five millions. We have grown up, not as distinct, independent and conflicting communities, but as one corporate body, breathing the same atmosphere of freedom, governed by the same laws, enjoying the same political rights. I see in all this a wonderful manifestation of the humanizing and elevating influence of Christian civilization. We receive from abroad people of various nations, races and tongues, habits and temperament, who speedily become assimilated to the human mass, and who form one homogeneous society. What is the secret of our social stability and order? It results from wise laws, based on Christian principles, and which are the echo of God's eternal law.

What is the cohesive power that makes us one body politic out of so many heterogeneous elements? It is the religion of Christ. We live as brothers because we recognize the brotherhood of humanity—one Father in heaven, one origin, one destiny.

We shall appreciate our Christian civilization all the more by considering the aboriginal tribes of North America, with whom war was the rule and peace the exception; or by casting our eyes on the numerous tribes of Africa, who, though living side by side for ages, enjoy no friendly intercourse, but are habitually at war with one another. And had our country been colonized, developed and ruled by races hostile to religion, we should seek in vain for the social order and civic blessings that we possess to-day.

### III.

#### THE DANGERS THAT THREATEN OUR AMERICAN CIVILIZATION.

But if our government and legislation are permeated and fortified by divine Revelation and Christian traditions, we cannot ignore the fact that they are assailed by unbelief, impiety

and socialism. We have our moral Hell-Gate, which threatens our ship of state, and which it requires more than the genius of a Newton to remove. If we have strong hopes for the future of our country, we are also not without fears. The dangers that threaten our civilization may be traced to the family. The root of the commonwealth is in the homes of the people. The social and civil life springs from the domestic life of mankind. The official life of a nation is ordinarily the reflex of the moral sense of the people. The morality of public administration is to be gauged by the moral standard of the family. The river does not rise above its source.

We are confronted by three great evils—Mormonism and divorce, which strike at the root of the family and society; an imperfect and vicious system of education, which undermines the religion of our youth; and the desecration of the Christian Sabbath, which tends to obliterate in our adult population the salutary fear of God and the homage that we owe Him. Our insatiable greed for gain, the coëxistence of colossal wealth with abject poverty, the extravagance of the rich, the discontent of the poor, our eager and impetuous rushing through life, the gross and systematic election frauds, and every other moral and social delinquency, may be traced to one of the three radical vices enumerated above.

Every man that has the welfare of his country at heart cannot fail to view with alarm the existence and the gradual development of Mormonism, which is a plague-spot on our civilization, a discredit to our government, a degradation of the female sex, and a standing menace to the sanctity of the marriage bond. The feeble and spasmodic attempts that have been made to repress this social evil, and the virtual immunity that it enjoys, have rendered its apostles bold and defiant. Formerly they were content with enlisting recruits from England, Wales, Sweden and other parts of Scandinavia; but now, emboldened by toleration, they send their emissaries throughout the country and obtain disciples from North Carolina, Georgia, and other States of the Union.

The reckless facility with which divorce is procured is an evil scarcely less deplorable than Mormonism; indeed, it is in some respects more dangerous than the latter, for divorce has the sanction of the civil law which Mormonism has not. Is not the law of divorce a virtual toleration of Mormonism in a modified form? Mormonism consists in simultaneous polygamy, while the law of divorce practically leads to successive polygamy.

Each State has in its statutes a list of causes, or rather pretexts, which are recognized as sufficient ground for divorce *a vinculo*. There are in all twenty-two or more causes, most of them of a very

trifling character, and in some States, as in Illinois and Maine, the power of granting a divorce is left to the discretion of the judge.<sup>1</sup>

The second evil that bodes mischief to our country and endangers the stability of our government, arises from our mutilated and vicious system of public school education. I am persuaded that the popular errors now existing in reference to education spring from an incorrect notion of that term. *To educate* means *to bring out*, to develop the intellectual, moral, and religious faculties of the soul. An education, therefore, that improves the mind and the memory, to the neglect of moral and religious training, is at best but an imperfect and defective system. According to Webster's definition, to educate is "to instil into the mind principles of art, science, *morals, religion*, and behavior." "To educate," he says, "in the arts is important; in religion, indispensable."

It is, indeed, eminently useful that the intellect of our youth should be developed, and that they should be made familiar with those branches of knowledge which they are afterward likely to pursue. They can then go forth into the world, gifted with a well-furnished mind and armed with a lever by which they may elevate themselves in the social scale and become valuable members of society. It is also most desirable that they should be made acquainted in the course of their studies with the history of our country, with the origin and principles of its government, and with the eminent men who have served it by their statesmanship and defended it by their valor. This knowledge will instruct them in their civic duties and rights, and contribute to make them enlightened citizens and devoted patriots.

But it is not enough for children to have a secular education; they

---

<sup>1</sup> Afghanistan has the questionable honor of presenting a new plea for divorce, which, if applied to this country, might fill with dismay many unfortunate husbands uncongenial with their spouses. "A Lahore newspaper states that an Afghan lady recently applied to the Ameer Abdul Rahman for a separation from her husband on the ground that he was becoming bald. The defender and savior of Afghan unity, recognizing the importance of vindicating the sanctity of domestic as well as governmental authority, decided, after due reflection upon the demoralizing tendency of feminine disrespect for intellectual men, to make an example of the presumptuous plaintiff. His first step was to order a vial of sour milk to be poured on the husband's head, whether as an 'invigorator' or 'tonic' the eastern journalist does not say. Then, abandoning curative for punitive measures, the Ameer next commanded the wife to lick the milk off with her tongue, and when that was done, and the husband's head shone like a billiard ball, his highness directed that the unsympathetic woman should be 'placed on the back of a donkey with her face to the tail, and thus be forced to ride through the bazaar.' After that she knew better, it is reported, than to jeer heartlessly at the misfortune of the head of the house. A humane silence, if not respectful commiseration, was the least that a proper respect for the marriage vow dictated. To the ladies of America the Ameer's conduct will perhaps savor of oriental despotism, but it is possible that not a few of their worse halves will envy the position of honor that Eastern law secures to the bald-headed husband."



must receive a religious training. Indeed, religious knowledge is as far above human science as the soul is above the body, as heaven is above earth, as eternity is above time. The little child that is familiar with the Christian catechism, is really more enlightened on truths that should come home to every rational mind, than the most profound philosophers of pagan antiquity, or even than many of the so-called philosophers of our own times. He has mastered the great problem of life. He knows his origin, his sublime destiny, and the means of attaining it, a knowledge that no human science can impart without the light of Revelation.

God has given us a *heart* to be formed to virtue, as well as a *head* to be enlightened. By secular education we improve the mind; by religious training we direct the heart.

It is not sufficient, therefore, to know how to read and write, to understand the rudiments of grammar and arithmetic. It does not suffice to know that two and two make four; we must practically learn also the great distance between time and eternity. The knowledge of bookkeeping is not sufficient, unless we are taught, also, how to balance our accounts daily between our conscience and our God. It will profit us little to understand all about the diurnal and annual motions of the earth, unless we add to this science some heavenly astronomy. We should know and feel that our future home is to be beyond the stars in heaven, and that, if we lead virtuous lives here, we shall "shine as stars for all eternity."<sup>1</sup>

We want our children to receive an education that will make them not only learned, but pious men. We want them to be not only polished members of society, but also conscientious Christians. We desire for them a training that will form their heart, as well as expand their mind. We wish them to be not only men of the world, but, above all, men of God.

A knowledge of history is most useful and important for the student. He should be acquainted with the lives of those illustrious heroes that founded empires,—of those men of genius that enlightened the world by their wisdom and learning, and embellished it by their works of art.

But is it not more important to learn something of the King of kings who created all these kingdoms, and by whom kings reign? Is it not more important to study that uncreated wisdom before whom all earthly wisdom is folly, and to admire the works of the Divine Artist who paints the lily and gilds the clouds?

If, indeed, our soul were to die with the body, if we had no existence beyond the grave, if we had no account to render to God

---

<sup>1</sup> Dan., xii., 3.

for our actions, we might more easily dispense with the catechism in our schools. Though even then Christian morality would be a faithful source of temporal blessings; for, as the Apostle teaches, "Piety is profitable to all things, having promise of *the life that now is*, and of that which is to come."<sup>1</sup>

But our youth cherish the hope of becoming one day citizens of heaven, as well as of this land. And as they cannot be good citizens of this country without studying and observing its laws, neither can they become citizens of heaven unless they know and practise the laws of God. Now, it is only by a good religious education that we learn to know and to fulfil our duties toward our Creator.

The religious and secular education of our children cannot be *divorced* from each other without inflicting a fatal wound upon the soul. The usual consequence of such a separation is to paralyze the moral faculties and to foment a spirit of indifference in matters of faith. Education is to the soul what food is to the body. The milk, with which the infant is nourished at its mother's breast, feeds not only its head, but permeates at the same time its heart and the other organs of the body. In like manner, the intellectual and moral growth of our children must go hand in hand; otherwise, their education is shallow and fragmentary, and often proves a curse instead of a blessing.

Piety is not to be put on like a holiday dress, to be worn on state occasions, but it is to be exhibited in our conduct at all times. Our youth must put in practice every day the Commandments of God and the precepts of the Church, as well as the rules of grammar and arithmetic. How can they familiarize themselves with these sacred duties, if they are not daily inculcated?

Guizot, an eminent Protestant writer of France, expresses himself so clearly and forcibly on this point that we cannot forbear quoting his words: "In order," he says, "to make popular education truly good and socially useful, it must be fundamentally religious. . . . It is necessary that national education should be given and received in the midst of a religious atmosphere, and that religious impressions and religious observances should penetrate into all its parts. Religion is not a study or an exercise, to be restricted to a certain place or a certain hour; it is a faith and a law, which ought to be felt everywhere, and which, after this manner alone, can exercise all its beneficial influence upon our mind and our life."

The catechetical instructions given once a week in our Sunday-schools, though productive of very beneficial results, are insuf-

---

<sup>1</sup> I. Tim., iv., 8.

ficient to supply the religious wants of our children. They should, as far as possible, breathe every day a healthy religious atmosphere in those schools in which not only is their mind enlightened, but the seeds of faith, piety, and sound morality are nourished and invigorated. By what principle of justice can you store their minds with earthly knowledge for several hours each day, while their heart, which requires far more cultivation, must be content with the paltry allowance of a few weekly lessons?

Nor am I unmindful of the blessed influence of a home education, and especially of a mother's tutelage. As she is her child's first instructor, her lessons are the most deep and lasting. The intimate knowledge she has acquired of her child's character by constant intercourse, the tender love subsisting between them, and the unbounded confidence placed in her by her pupil, impart to her instructions a force and conviction which no other teacher can hope to win.

But how many mothers have not the time to devote to the education of their children! How many mothers have not the capacity! How many, alas, have not the inclination!

And granted even that the mother has done her duty, the child's training does not end with the mother, but it will be supplemented by a curriculum in other schools. And, of what avail is a mother's toil, if the seeds of faith that she has planted are choked by the tares of impiety and infidelity, or attain a sickly growth in the cheerless atmosphere of a schoolroom from which the sun of religion is rigidly excluded?

The remedy for all this would be supplied if the denominational system, such as now obtains in Canada, were applied in our public schools.

The desecration of the Christian Sabbath is the third social danger against which it behooves us to set our face, and take timely precautions before it assumes proportions too formidable to be easily eradicated.

The custom of observing religious holidays has prevailed, both in ancient and modern times, among nations practising a false system of worship, as well as among those professing the true religion. They have set apart one day in the week, or at least certain days in the month or year, for the public and solemn worship of their Creator, just as they have instituted national festivals to commemorate some signal civic blessing obtained by their heroes and statesmen.

The Mohammedans devote Friday to public prayer and special almsgiving, because that day is appointed by the Koran.

The Parsees of Persia and India have four holidays each month consecrated to religious worship.



The Hebrew people were commanded by Almighty God to keep holy the Sabbath Day, or Saturday, because on that day God rested from His work.<sup>1</sup> He wished to remind them by this weekly celebration that He was their Creator and Master, and the Founder of the universe. He desired that they should be moved to worship Him by the contemplation of His works, and thus rise from nature to nature's God.

The Sabbath was marked also by a beneficent character, which admirably displays God's tender mercy toward His creatures and appeals with touching pathos to the compassion of the Hebrew master in behalf of his servant and beast of burden. "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord, thy God. Thou shalt not do any work therein, thou, nor thy . . . bondman and bondwoman, . . . nor any of thy beasts, nor the stranger that is within thy gates. . . . Remember that thou also wast a slave in the land of Egypt, and the Lord thy God brought thee out from thence with a strong hand and a stretched-out arm."<sup>2</sup>

The prophet Isaiah attaches abundant blessings to the due observance of the day: "The children of the stranger that adhere to the Lord to worship Him, and to love His name, to be His servants: every one that keepeth the Sabbath from profaning it, and that holdeth fast my covenant; I will bring them into My holy mount, and will make them joyful in My house of prayer; their holocausts and their victims shall please Me upon My altar. For My house shall be called the house of prayer for all nations."<sup>3</sup>

The prophet Ezekiel declares the profanation of the Sabbath foremost among the national sins of the Jews, and the chief cause of their national calamities. "I lifted up My hand upon them in the wilderness, to disperse them among the nations, and to scatter them through the countries: because they had not done my judgments, and had cast off my statutes, and had violated My Sabbaths."

It is the opinion of Grotius and of other learned commentators that the Sabbath was held sacred for generations prior to the time of Moses, and its observance, according to Lightfoot and other writers, dates even from the creation, or, at least, from the Fall of Adam. Hence they maintain that the Jewish lawgiver, in prescribing the Sabbath, was not enacting a new commandment, but enforcing an old one.

This inference is drawn from the words of Genesis: "And He blessed the seventh day and sanctified it,"<sup>4</sup> which plainly means that He then instituted it as a day of rest and prayer for Adam and all his posterity. It is manifest also from the significant fact that

<sup>1</sup> Exod., xx., 8.

<sup>3</sup> Isaiah, lvi., 6, 7.

<sup>2</sup> Deut., v., 14, 15.

<sup>4</sup> Gen., ii., 3.

the Hebrew people, for some time before they received the Law on Mount Sinai, were enjoined in the desert to abstain on the Sabbath Day from gathering manna, and to rest from all servile work.<sup>1</sup> The same conclusion is obvious from the very words of the precept: *Remember* to keep holy the Sabbath Day, by which God recalls to their mind an already-existing ordinance which had grown well-nigh obsolete during their bondage in Egypt. This inference is, moreover, warranted by the fact that the Sabbath was kept sacred by the Egyptians, as Herodotus testifies. We cannot suppose that a people, so tenacious of their traditions, would adopt from their own slaves a religious custom that was rarely, if ever, practised by the slaves themselves, owing to their wretched condition. We are, therefore, justified in asserting that it was derived from the primitive law given to Adam.

With what profound reverence, then, should we view an ordinance instituted to draw man closer to his Maker, and to inculcate on him humanity toward his fellow-beings and compassion for even the beast of burden; an ordinance, whose observance was requited by temporal blessings, and whose violation was avenged by grievous calamities; an ordinance, which was first proclaimed at the dawn of human life, re-echoed on Mount Sinai, and engraved by the finger of God on the Decalogue; an ordinance, which applies to all times and places, and which is demanded by the very exigencies of our nature!

Sunday, or the Lord's Day, is consecrated by the Christian world to public worship and to rest from servile work, in order to commemorate the Resurrection of our Saviour from the grave, by which He consummated the work of our Redemption, and to foreshadow the glorious resurrection of the elect and the eternal rest that will be theirs in the life to come. "We who have believed," says the Apostle, "shall enter into rest." "There remaineth, therefore, a day of rest for the people of God."<sup>2</sup> Yea, an everlasting day of rest and supreme felicity prefigured by the repose of the ancient Sabbath. Most appropriately, indeed, has Sunday been chosen. If it was proper to solemnize the day on which God created the world, how much more meet to celebrate the day on which He redeemed it.

As the worship of our Creator is nourished and perpetuated by religious festivals, so does it languish when they are unobserved, and so does it become paralyzed when they are suppressed. Whenever the enemies of God seek to destroy the religion of a people, they find no means so effectual for carrying out their impious design as the suppression of the Sabbath. Thus, when Antiochus deter-

---

Exod., xvi., 23.<sup>2</sup> Heb., iv., 9-11.

mined to abolish the sacred laws of the Hebrew people and to compel them to conform to the practice of idolatry, he defiled the Temples of Jerusalem and Garizim, he put an end to the Jewish sacrifices, and, above all, he forbade, under pain of death, the *observance of the Sabbath and the other religious solemnities*, substituting in their stead his own birthday and the Feast of Bacchus as days of sacrifice and licentious indulgence.<sup>1</sup>

The leaders of the French Revolution of 1793 adopted similar methods for the extirpation of the Lord's Day in France. The churches were profaned and dedicated to the *Goddess of Reason*; the priests were exiled or put to death. The very name of Sunday, or Lord's Day, was abolished from the calendar, that every hallowed tradition associated with that day might be obliterated from the minds of the people.

And it is a well-known fact that, in our own times, the enemies of religion are the avowed opponents of the Christian Sabbath. I have seen Sunday violated in Paris, in Brussels, and in other capitals of Europe. And even in Rome I have seen government workmen engaged on the Lord's Day in excavating and in building, a profanation which grieved the Holy Father, as he himself acknowledged to me. Who are they that profane the Sunday in those cities of Europe? They are men lost to all sense of religion, who glory in their impiety and who aim at the utter extirpation of Christianity.

A close observer cannot fail to note the dangerous inroads that have been made on the Lord's Day in our country within the last quarter of a century. If these encroachments are not checked in time, the day may come when the religious quiet, now happily reigning in Baltimore and other well-ordered cities, will be changed into noise and turbulence, when the sound of the church-bell will be drowned by the echo of the hammer and the dray, when the Bible and the prayer book will be supplanted by the newspaper and the magazine, when the votaries of the theatre and the drinking saloon will outnumber the religious worshippers, and salutary thoughts of God, of eternity, and of the soul will be choked by the cares of business and by the pleasures and dissipation of the world.

We cannot but admire the wisdom of God and His ultimate knowledge of the human heart in designating one day in the week on which public homage should be paid Him. So engrossing are the cares and occupations of life, so absorbing its pleasures, that it is difficult, if not impossible, to direct the thoughts of mankind to the higher pursuits of virtue and religious worship unless a special

---

<sup>1</sup> II. Mac., vi.



time is set apart for these spiritual exercises. We have certain hours assigned to the various functions of daily life. We have stated hours for retiring to rest at night and for rising from sleep, for partaking of our meals, and for attending to our regular avocations of life. If we attended to these ordinary functions only when the spirit would move us, only when inclination would prompt, our health would be impaired and our temporal interests would suffer. And so, too, would our spiritual nature grow torpid if there were no fixed day for renovating it by the exercise of divine praise and adoration. We might for a time worship God at irregular intervals, but very probably we would end by neglecting to commune with Him altogether.

The Christian Sabbath is a living witness of Revelation, an abiding guardian of Christianity. The religious services held in our churches each successive Sunday are the most effective means for keeping fresh in the minds and hearts of our people the sublime and salutary teachings of the Gospel. Our churches exercise on the truths of Revelation an influence analogous to that exerted by our courts of justice on the civil law. The silence and solemnity of the court, the presence of the presiding judge, the power with which he is clothed, the weight of his decisions, give an authority to our civil and criminal jurisprudence and invest it with a sanction which it could not have if our courts were closed.

In like manner, the religious decorum observed in our temples of worship, the holiness of the place, the sacred character of the officiating ministers, above all, the reading and exposition of the Sacred Scriptures, inspire men with a reverence for the Divine Law and cause it to exert a potent influence in the moral guidance of the community. The summary closing of our civil tribunals would not entail a more disastrous injury on the laws of the land than the closing of our churches would inflict on the Christian religion.

How many social blessings are obtained by the due observance of the Lord's Day! The institution of the Christian Sabbath has contributed more to the peace and good order of nations than could be accomplished by standing armies and the best organized police force. The officers of the law are a terror, indeed, to evil doers, whom they arrest for overt acts; while the ministers of religion, by the lessons they inculcate, prevent crime by appealing to the conscience, and promote peace in the kingdom of the soul.

The cause of charity and mutual benevolence is greatly fostered by the sanctification of the Sunday. When we assemble in church on the Lord's Day, we are admonished by that very act that we are all members of the same social body, and that we should have for one another the same lively sympathy and spirit of cooperation

which the members of the human body entertain toward one another. We are reminded that we are all enlivened and sanctified by the same Spirit. "There are diversities of graces," says the Apostle, "but the same Spirit; and there are diversities of ministers, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but the same God who worketh all in all."<sup>1</sup> We all have divers pursuits and avocations; we occupy different grades of society, but in the house of God all these distinctions are levelled. The same Spirit that enters the heart of the most exalted citizens, does not disdain to descend also into the soul of the humblest peasant. We all profess our faith in the same Creator, and we are all regenerated by the waters of baptism. We hope for the same heaven. We meet as brothers and sisters of the same Lord whose blood was shed on the Cross not only to cleanse our soul from sin, but to cement our hearts in love. We are, in a word, taught the comforting lesson that we all have one God and Father in heaven. "One body," says the Apostle, "one Spirit, as you are called in one hope of your vocation. One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all."<sup>2</sup>

And how can we hesitate to render to our Creator this reasonable service? We give six days to our temporal affairs; let us devote one day to our eternal interests. Six days we spend in the society of our fellow-men; let us consecrate one day to conversing with our Maker. Six days we lay up treasures on earth; on the seventh we should lay up treasures in heaven.

If, indeed, the observance of the Sunday were irksome and difficult, there would be some excuse for neglecting this ordinance. But it is a duty which, so far from involving labor and self-denial, contributes to health of body and contentment of mind. The Christian Sunday is not to be confounded with the Jewish or even the Puritan Sabbath. It prescribes the golden mean between rigid sabbatarianism on the one hand, and lax indulgence on the other. There is little doubt that the revulsion in public sentiment from a rigorous to a loose observance of the Lord's Day, can be ascribed to the sincere but misguided zeal of the Puritans, who confounded the Christian Sunday with the Jewish Sabbath, and imposed restraints on the people which were repulsive to Christian freedom, and which were not warranted by the Gospel dispensation. The Lord's Day to the Catholic heart is always a day of joy. The Church desires us on that day to be cheerful without dissipation, grave and religious without sadness and melancholy. She forbids, indeed, all unnecessary servile work on that day; but as "the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath," she allows

---

<sup>1</sup> I. Cor., xii., 4-6.

<sup>2</sup> Ephes., iv., 4-6.

such work whenever charity or necessity may demand it. And as it is a day not only of religion, but also of relaxation of mind and body, she permits us to spend a portion of it in innocent recreation. In a word, the true conception of the Lord's Day is expressed in the words of the Psalmist: "This is the day which the Lord hath made, let us be glad and rejoice therein."

---

### AN ITALIAN CHAMPION OF CATHOLIC RIGHTS.

WHEN to Carlalberto, fugitive and broken-hearted on the far-off shore of Portugal, Victor Emmanuel II. had succeeded, and Piedmontese ambition, leagued with Garibaldi and Mazzini, and guided by the genius of Cavour, was preparing all Italy for another and a more successful war against Austria, Cesare Cantù was pursuing his own intellectual labors, directing all of them towards the realization of his cherished dream of an Italy independent, united, and Catholic.

Then appeared the work which he had conceived the plan of in his Austrian prison, his *Storia degli Italiani*, in six volumes, the work which had been the cherished subject of his studies all through the preceding years, and while giving to the public so many precious fruits of his genius. He had put into its composition his whole heart and soul, both as an Italian and as a Catholic. Any serious-minded lover of Italy, who reads these six pregnant volumes through, must be convinced, long before he finishes their perusal, that the coming generation of Italians will find in these glowing and patriotic pages the most eloquent exhortation to be true to the religion and the ideal of their mediæval ancestors.

The Neo-Guelph's aspirations are apparent throughout. These, of course, were equally distasteful to the courts of Vienna and Turin, the former of which considered the Lombardo-Venetian provinces as the southernmost portion of the former German Empire, while the latter aimed at nothing less than blotting out in the Peninsula every sovereignty but its own. Indeed, the Piedmontese king and statesmen were far more bitterly opposed to Cantù's teaching than his own Austrian rulers; the very idea of an Italian Confederation, especially of one in which the Pope should be the presiding authority, was an abomination to Victor Emmanuel and



Cavour. How much more distasteful it was to Mazzini and Garibaldi, the reader needs not to be told.

The work was published in Turin. The last two volumes were not allowed to pass the frontiers of Lombardy. No sooner had the first volume appeared than the *liberal* press of Piedmont denounced once more the author and his religious views. This denunciation increased in violence when the last volumes appeared, describing recent events, and painting contemporary personages, with the generous freedom of one to whom the love of truth and native country was the sole and supreme guide.

In 1855 the Concordat, concluded between Pius IX. and the Emperor Francis Joseph, stipulated the abrogation of the hateful laws enacted in the last century against the Church by Joseph II. This was a result that Cantù had labored for all his life. It drew from him warm expressions of approval. But this measure of religious liberty, bestowed so tardily on all Catholics in the Austrian Empire, was looked upon as a step backward by the Piedmontese Government, whose every act now tended toward doing away with all the time-honored institutions and liberties of the Church within its own dominions.

So Cantù was held up to public scorn as a mediæval bigot.

Then came the Archduke Maximilian with his enthusiastic wife, both bent on transforming Lombardy and Venice into the happiest of happy lands. It was a noble dream, which the jealousy of the Viennese Cabinet and the intrigues of Piedmont would not permit to be realized, even though Maximilian had united superior statesmanship with unquestioned sincerity of purpose. The two royal dreamers experienced a rude awakening, and were sent to their lovely castle of Miramar \*to indulge in other bright visions of peoples regenerated and empires founded, all of which were to end in the pitiful tragedy we know of.

The great historian, whose name and person Maximilian had loved from his boyhood, was eagerly sought for by him on his arrival in Milan. The new viceroy intended to replace the oppressive centralized administration of the provinces intrusted to him by institutions inaugurating a system of local self-government. And, doubtless, he would have carried out his purpose, had his powers been greater, and had he been sustained by the imperial authorities. He soon found out, however, that he could only count on their support in his conservative and repressive measures. Every attempt to found a more liberal *régime* was promptly and finally disavowed by the Viennese ministers.

Cantù, who aimed at bringing together the leading men of Lombardy and Venetia, in some legal deliberative body, which might be the forerunner of better things, urged the Prince to call together

the noblest men and most illustrious scholars of his government in a council of public instruction.

The proposal, however, only drew on Maximilian an open rebuke, and on Cantù an increase of "watchfulness" from the Austrian police. Worse than that, another calumny was devised against the latter by the unscrupulous police officials, and zealously circulated in Piedmont and throughout all Italy by the Sardinian statesmen and the agents of secret societies. It was to the effect that Cantù had drawn up a petition, for which he was soliciting signatures everywhere, to erect Lombardy and Venice into an Italian kingdom, with Maximilian as its sovereign.

Vainly did Cantù deny the whole thing as a malicious fabrication, demanding the appointment of "a jury of honor," even were it composed of his adversaries, to investigate and pronounce on the matter. The purpose of the calumniator is to have his slander believed and circulated, not to have the truth or falsehood of his statements examined. No tribunal was established. The judgment of all honorable men, even in Piedmont, was well expressed by the celebrated Brofferio, then the most eloquent of the advanced Radicals: "Between all the scribblers who here in Turin defile with their ink such quantities of paper, and only produce such miserable squibs, and Cesare Cantù, whom the Austrian guillotine does not frighten from writing so nobly and so outspokenly the truth about Italy, my choice is soon made."

While slander was thus systematically at work, undermining the reputation, ruining the influence, and poisoning the life of the courageous historian, the cannon of Magenta and Solferino was drowning every other sound in Italy, and the scheme of a confederated Italy, under the presidency of the Pope, proclaimed by Napoleon III., with the seeming consent of Victor Emmanuel, made Cantù himself forget all personal griefs in the prospect of the near regeneration of his country.

Was the great hope of his life about to be fulfilled? Was Providence about to reward the sufferings and labors of himself and the other Neo-Guelphs by this wonderful result of a war undertaken with such questionable motives and directed by passions less creditable still? At any rate, so widely known was the part taken by the author of *Algisio* in advocating a confederated Italy, that immediately after the Battle of Solferino Napoleon sent for him.

"As I was better known outside than inside of Italy," Cantù says in his *Cronistoria*, "a mutual friend induced the emperor to send for me. So, at his invitation, I went to his headquarters. He said he knew what I had endured, and how little sympathy I had for the first Napoleon, and undertook to justify him, saying

that nothing but a fitting opportunity prevented him from creating Italian nationality. Naturally, thereupon, I urged him to carry out the *Napoleonic idea*. He related to me at length all that he had done, and all that he proposed doing. His cousin (Prince Napoleon Jerome), who had just arrived, was to besiege Mantua, the King of Sardinia was to invest Peschiera, he—Napoleon—was to attack Verona immediately. ‘A pretty hard bone to gnaw,’ he said. Forty thousand men were to land at Venice. That same day, he had seen the Hungarian Kossuth, whom Napoleon had called to ascertain if they could count on a rising in Hungary. Like all these exiles, Kossuth made great promises. But the emperor seemed to be on his guard with him, or perhaps he was satisfied with worming some secrets out of him, and said : *If Austria should continue the war, your co-operation would be needed. Hold yourself in readiness.* Subsequently, from Napoleon and from Picri, the Imperial Prefect of Police, just arrived from Paris, I learned that there were disturbances in France, and that the presence of the emperor might become necessary at home. I mentioned this to his majesty, who at once protested, saying : *I shall not leave Italy till the whole thing is done and over.*

“Then, again, speaking of the future of Italy, he said : *It shall be a confederation, with the Pope at its head,* and so on, as the matter is laid down in La Guéronnière’s pamphlet. I mentioned, as opposed to this plan, the risings which were encouraged elsewhere, and he said distinctly : *This is what annoys me.* And, as I spoke of the companions of Ulysses letting loose the winds while he was asleep, he said in quite a loud voice, and smiling : ‘Well, I shall say the *Quos ego*.’”

“This is not the place,” continues Cantù, “to give at length the details of our conversation, which sufficed to give umbrage to those who considered me to be more Italian than Piedmontese. As to Napoleon’s sincerity, we shall see the proofs of it.”<sup>1</sup>

Whatever hopes of a confederated Italy the Neo-Guelphs may have conceived, on learning the purport of this conversation, or on reading the proclamation of Napoleon after the armistice concluded at Villafranca, were soon dispelled by Napoleon’s allies. He—shallow adventurer that he was—had let loose the winds, and among them the whirlwind of Prussian ambition, which was fated to sweep his throne and himself from the face of the continent. He had let loose the mad torrent of revolutionary and anti-Christian passions, thinking that he could, at any moment, raise a dam across their path, and force them back to their former obscure channels.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dell’ Indipendenza Italiana ; Cronistoria, vol. iii., p. 265, note.



The revolution, though apparently checked for the time being, was gathering strength. It had at its service Cavour and the organized forces of Piedmont, and it had as auxiliaries the hands of the secret societies in every Italian city. All these elements were directed by one will, that of Cavour,—a will which no scruple of conscience or sentiment of honor restrained. Of course, they prevailed over the divided counsels and timid resistance of the majority of Italians. And so the *Kingdom of Italy* arose out of the union of Lombardy with Piedmont and the disruption of the states of Central Italy.

Thus came to an end the day-dream of the Neo-Guelphs. In the first *Italian Parliament*, which met in Turin, Cantù appeared as the champion of the cause to which his life had been devoted,—that of Italy, free and Catholic. He had never conspired in secret even to compass the most noble of patriotic aims, the liberation of his country from a foreign yoke. He had fought the enemies of Italy in the open light of day by his indefatigable pen, by his eloquent speeches, by his undisguised, loyal, and invincible hostility. And this battle of a lifetime was avowedly for the religion as well as the independence of Italy.

He took his place in the Chamber of Deputies as the representative and spokesman of all those who yearned to see the faith of their forefathers become the very soul of the national life in the new era upon which Italians were entering.

His indomitable courage, his open avowal of Catholicity in the presence of an assembly in which the immense majority were haters of all religion, and intolerant of any opinion favorable to their own baptismal creed, were admired even by his bitterest adversaries. His learning and eloquence, as well as his pluck, always secured him a respectful, if not a sympathetic hearing. In May, 1864, there was a motion to prevent the collecting or sending of "Peter's pence" to the Pope. Cantù rose to speak against it.

"The House," he said, "by permitting me to address it, gives proof that toleration is one of the best guarantees of liberty. Every one here present knows that I rise to advocate a cause that finds no sympathy among the greatest number. I must remind you that the justice of no cause is to be measured by majorities or by success. The gods of old may have favored Cæsar victorious, but posterity did not judge that Cato vanquished was in the wrong. . . .

"You are unwilling that donations should be made to the Pope, because he is a sovereign, and because our bishops have endowments. But when you will have taken away from the Pope his principality, and from the bishops their property, how are they to

live? Of the free offerings made by the charitable. Do I understand you to say that kings should be their almsgivers? This would scarcely be democratic: free men may be unwilling to see the guiders of so many consciences proposed by a minister to the king as deserving of a salary, and nominated by the king as persons capable of filling a salaried office. I may speak to you freely about the Pope, since I have nothing to hope from him, nothing but that he shall send me his blessing at my last hour.

"The men who subscribe their names to the 'Peter's Pence' fund give us all a salutary example of moral courage. . . .

"Let us confess it: what is most needed in our day is such courage among citizens, that of holding an opinion, a conscientious conviction; the courage to profess it openly, not only in presence of two or three persons, but before the multitude, in newspapers, in assemblies, in this House of Parliament.

"If you deplore the lack of this social courage; if you regret the lowering of the moral standard of character, the sudden and total changes of religious profession, the unnecessary public retractions we see, and the cowardly indifference men show toward truth and error;—well, then, do not let us increase this avowed evil. To-day those who send their alms to the Pope, do so in open day; the names and the lists are printed and published: do you want these things to be done henceforth in the dark? . . . . Do not, I beseech you, make people feel that one must be either disloyal or intrepid when one says: I am a Christian—a Roman Catholic!"

The Italian Parliament was on a very steep incline, hurried downward to one subversive measure after another, because it was impelled by the fiery and blind revolutionary spirit, like a locomotive without the controlling hand of the engineer.

In February, 1865, the ministers—as a preliminary step toward transferring the seat of government from Turin to Florence—demanded the immediate adoption by the Chamber, without any discussion whatever, of the draught of an entire code of laws for all Italy, and several important separate bills, among them one doing away with ecclesiastical marriage, and thereby opening a wide door to divorce.

It was parliamentary despotism thinly veiled under the form of political, or, rather, of revolutionary necessity.

Cantù was not the man to submit to such dictation, especially when the dearest interests of religion and the family were about to be sacrificed.

"We all know," he said, in rising, "that in the life of a nation, as in that of an individual man, there happen *fatal necessities* which inexorably decide on their own whole future. Such is the neces-

sity, it would appear, which Italy now experiences of unifying its legislation.

"I ask that we have engraved over the portal of this Chamber the word *Ἀνάγκη*. . . . For this is the word which has been unceasingly ringing in our ears for some time past."

After this exordium, he examined at length the several grounds on which the proposed changes could be claimed to be necessary, dwelling with peculiar force on the alleged political reasons.

"You will ask me what I, on my side, would propose. Indeed, I am well aware that there can be no serious opposition made to such a measure as this without having a well-defined programme to substitute for the obnoxious law, and without the courage to support that programme.

"I am a conservative of the old-English school, which admits of no change not founded on reasons of serious inconvenience, demonstrated in free and open discussion. With Walpole I shall say to you: *Nolite quæta movere*. With one much older than Walpole I shall say, that nothing but extreme necessity can authorize a change in the laws. Let whatever is well, and doing well enough, alone. Such has been our law (on marriage) during the last three hundred years. Allow the form given to it by the Council of Trent to remain in full force: it makes of both marriage-contract and the sacrament one and the same thing, and thereby shuts the door against clandestine marriages. As to the inconveniences, to meet them I should propose, as a liberal member, my usual remedy—freedom."

He then moved "that all marriages celebrated according to the ritual of the contracting parties should be held to be valid in law. To obtain the civil effect attached thereto, they must be immediately registered by the proper civil officer."

Brave words, these, and most wise counsels. They were not listened to.

In 1864-65 began the parliamentary campaign against the monastic orders. Cantù, who knew better than any living man how little the French *people* had profited by the confiscation of church property, the suppression of monasteries, and the sequestration of their landed possessions during the great revolution, was also well informed of the baneful results of similar measures in Spain and Portugal,—in Spain, especially, where the most glorious edifices of the Middle Ages were ruthlessly destroyed or allowed to fall into ruin, and the property of the suppressed orders became the prey of the ministers in power, or of their numerous and greedy retainers. The most enlightened French statesmen, even when professing to be the irreconcilable enemies of the monks, did not hesitate to say that the indiscriminating cruelty shown toward



them was a national wrong, and the confiscation of their homes and lands a blunder in political economy. When, nearly half a century afterwards, the Spanish ministry, in a time of peace and without the pretext of a revolution, repeated this iniquitous process of sequestration and wholesale suppression, the Liberals of France as well as of both Peninsulas denounced their conduct as a blunder, if not an injustice.

What did Cavour and Victor Emmanuel care for such public opinion? They were backed by English statesmen and churchmen, encouraged by the American press, and powerfully aided by the money and men contributed by the Bible and missionary societies in England and the United States. Provided the Papacy were overturned, and the monastic orders, the most efficient auxiliaries of the Papacy, were annihilated, they cared not what iniquities were committed. Cantù, hopeless as were his efforts in opposing government, parliament, secret societies, and the Evangelical Alliance, did not hesitate to raise his voice, and record his condemnation of the wrong in the face of all Europe. There are very few examples in all history of a more courageous resistance, or of an eloquence more admirable, both in its literary forms and its lofty spirit of religious conviction.

"The patrimony (of the monastic orders) which you threaten to sweep away," he said on April 12, 1865, "became the property of the Church in three ways: by free gift, by purchase, by reclaiming the soil from the wilderness. This last title to its possession is the most extensive. As to the donations of land, they were executed in conformity with the laws, and with the express sanction of the public magistrate.

"How can you lay your hands on the soil which the Church has acquired by the sweat of her brow? You will tell me that these lands belong to corporations, to moral entities created by the State and which the State can do away with. I reply that there are other like entities, associations formed for a moral, industrial, or even political purpose, which are not threatened in their capacity or their liberties. Why not destroy them also? You feel you cannot do this without violating the right of free association. As to the right of the State to interfere, I am free to admit that the State is the guardian of all such associations; but is it, then, the right of a guardian to rob his wards? Montesquieu has said: *Make sacred and inviolable the ancient and necessary patrimony of the clergy; let it be sacred for all eternity like the clergy themselves.*

"I see that in dealing with our Protestant and Jewish brethren you are more liberal than in dealing with Catholics; the Government does not concern itself with the right of circumcision or the

Kypurim. . . . You do not even interfere in the question about the property of the Jewish universities, unless by declaring in the law of July 4, 1857, . . . . that the Israelite universities are incorporated, . . . . are constituted lawful owners of their property for the exercise of their religious worship and the bestowing of religious instruction.

" . . . . The Catholic Church, therefore, shall enjoy the privilege of being persecuted, of being robbed, and insulted. What do you not dare to say against her ?

" Let me conclude. You say that the Church shall be free, but that she shall have none of the rights of a free man. She shall be a property owner, but only after the fashion we like. Others shall administer her property, she must not be allowed over it the superintendence granted to our senators, to our deputies, to our lay societies.

" In God's name, if she is free, then the State is not her guardian. The State may indeed enact just laws, but not prescribe to her what is for her good ; still less may it strip her of her possessions, under the pretext that this is for her advantage.

" . . . . One of our ministers has been heard to say in the Upper Chamber, that in our days the Church has been made to keep her proper place ; that the State moves forward in its own sphere without the Church, just as the Church does without the State.

" What an absurdity ! You might as well say that the body moves forward on its legs without its head, or that the blood can circulate without the action of the heart, or that man can breathe without his lungs. To show you how you contradict yourselves, I need only remind you that not a week passes without your publishing laws, decrees, and ministerial propositions concerning the most intimate details of ecclesiastical life ; you suppress the grants hitherto bestowed on our public charities ; you draught into the army and navy the students in our theological seminaries. You not only allow the fullest liberty to all who assail Catholic teaching ; but, besides thereby authorizing such an abuse of free speech, you encourage and rear the men who profit by it, you pay professors and journalists to assail our doctrines and make of your universities the succursals of the Evangelical meeting-houses. You make it a crime for priests to do what we consider to be the common right of all ; you make punishable the very fulfilment of what is to them a sacred duty, obedience to their superiors. You strip our cemeteries of their consecrated character, making them the burial-places of Catholics and non-Catholics alike ; you deprive the marriage ceremony of the priest's benediction.

"The Romans, as we see in Justinian's *Pandecta* and in the *Instituta* of Gaius, permitted all citizens to associate as they pleased, binding themselves by rules of their own choosing, on the sole condition that such rules did not endanger public order; to associate for every imaginable purpose, even to secure themselves public burial. The societies thus formed may acquire property, and this property, should the society itself be dissolved, must be devoted to the purpose for which it was originally acquired.

"Under this legislation the Christian religion fulfilled its social mission and reached the Middle Ages. A minister (the Honorable Signor Ugdulena) complains that I wish to make men go back to this dark period. I must remind him that I was, perhaps, the first in Italy to proclaim the need we had of studying the Middle Ages. Instead of calumniating this period, I have judged it to be a great progress as compared with pagan antiquity, as a battle-field between the forces of the dying past and those of a future which was fast shaping its own institutions. But no man who cannot cast off the narrow and sectarian spirit of our times, can enter into the spirit of universal humanity.

"I repeat it, we have much to learn from the Middle Ages, much which we might profitably borrow from them. How can we help wishing that society in our times were founded on religious faith, on reverence for authority? that a pontiff without armies might once more summon an emperor from the furthest limits of Germany to answer before him for violating the constitution he had sworn to respect? that we might once more behold upon earth men of strong, proud, and saintly character? that all social conditions should still preserve those habits of self-government which made of the community a republic under a king? Are not these things, one and all, quite foreign to the manner of our age, when the State absorbs everything, or a monarchy means despotism?

"Another minister (Pianelli) accuses me of making the modern world return to mediævalism, because I would wish public men to have a conscience, and infractions of the law to be accounted sinful.

"The minister and I have studied the Middle Ages from very different standpoints, probably; but we must have studied it, nevertheless, with such care as not to be confounded with the vulgar crowd, who are carried away by figures of rhetoric or frightened by airy phantoms which disappear with the first beams of light. I can see as clearly as he can the immeasurable distance which separates the period when Christianity was the generic term for civilization as well as morality, when the world had saved from shipwreck the common patrimony of all peoples not barbarians—



God, faith, laws, the rights of the Church, and the Latin tongue,—from those other times, when the bonds of unity are severed, and when we are struck with the opposite directions followed by human thought and social order. It was Sieyès, one of the standard-bearers of the French Revolution, who dared to say: ‘The (French) Nation, in its quality of lawmaker, cannot rightfully deprive me of my property or my private opinion. Security for the property-holder is essential to the work of every legislator. How could he create it, since he only exists in order to protect it? Church property, like all other property, belongs to the persons to whom the original donors willed it to belong. These were free to make of it any other lawful disposition they chose; but, in fact, they bestowed it, in due legal form, on the Church, and not on the nation.’

“It is true that some people say: ‘The priests can live on the almsgiven to them by the faithful;’ and, they add, with a sweet look of piety: ‘In the beginning the Church was poor, and it is only a zeal for her purity that impels us to limit her possessions to Peter’s fishing-bark and his nets.’

“I shall also ask why the King of Italy does not become once more the Count of Maurienne? Why do not the daughters of our sovereigns go, like Nausicaa, to wash the household linen at the public fountains? Why do not our admirable ministers do as did the magistrates of our mediæval republics, come before us with a bundle of papers under their arm,—that old-fashioned *bulgetta*, which gave its name to our BUDGET—a word which fills our people with affright?

“An age, like ours, which laughs at the *stigmata* of St. Francis, which consults somnambulists and rapping spirits, may well be unable to appreciate these great-hearted men, who were also the greatest minds in the most glorious period of Italian story. Those, however, who severely guard their mental vision against the illusions of the surrounding fog, are ready to look with veneration on those great teachers to whom Dante devoted his sublimest strains: and they were monks.

“The Middle Ages were a period of unlimited freedom for all corporations, for robust individual manhood, and, consequently, for the Church also. When degeneracy set in, when Florence substituted for Farinata degli Uberti King Robert of Anjou, when to Boniface VIII. succeeded Gianni Carracciolo, then it was that the writer who gave us Fiammetta the obscene instead of the heavenly Beatrice, befouled with his buffooneries the poor monks, and left us that heap of mud to which all the scribblers of our day go to find the dirt they throw.

“The democratic and republican spirit was extinguished by the

petty despotisms which sprang up. Artists, poets, philosophers, the Pagans of the Renaissance, labored to make a monarchy of Europe, and then it was that men began to decry and to destroy the monastic institutions for which Paolo Sarpi had so superb a contempt, because, indeed, 'they smelled of *the people*.'

"The witty sayings of Erasmus and the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum* made our fathers laugh, while the French 'liberators' and the conquering German hosts swept away every vestige of their independence. Our forefathers, nevertheless, would not have tolerated the platitudes which we bandy in our day, and which, besides being unqualifiedly vulgar, are so distasteful to good breeding and religious sentiment.

"But, in these Middle Ages, who was the most determined enemy of monastic institutions? Who but this Frederick II., this German who issued the most atrocious laws against heresy, who was the friend of that dreadful tyrant, Ezzelino,—of that Ezzelino who was wont to say that he dreaded more the poor monk, Brother Anthony of Lisbon, than all the Guelphs in arms. There is an intimate connection between every kind of liberty, as there is between every kind of tyranny.

"Who were your predecessors in the last century? Two Austrians. I think I am reading the decrees of Joseph II., of Austria, when I read your laws prohibiting processions in the public streets, the erection of altars in the open air for the solemnities of Corpus Christi, the collecting of alms, the ringing of church-bells at certain hours, the opening of church-doors in the evening. You will not tolerate confessions in the hospitals; no assistant may be appointed in a parish, without the approbation of the Ministry. The episcopal seminaries are no longer free to teach as of yore; in fact, we have a reproduction of the petty vexations which made Frederick the Great call Joseph II. *My Brother the Sacristan*, and which ought to obtain for you the designation of the *Sacristan Parliament*.

"Mirabeau said of Joseph II.: 'This man's panegyrists ought to tell what justice there is in compelling any citizen to quit the calling he had embraced with the sanction of his country's laws.' I must declare very frankly that I see as much wrong in driving out a monk or a nun from their peaceful retreat as there is in expelling any lay-citizen from his own dwelling.

"I can surely speak before an Italian Parliament of this sovereign with the same freedom with which I wrote of him under the penalties of Austrian censure and the dread of the government which stripped me of all lucrative employment. I have blamed him for expelling the learned Bollandists, and selling at auction their library and manuscripts; I shall also remind you here that

this same improvident and unloved reformer said on his deathbed: 'I have not succeeded in a single one of my undertakings.'

"All this worked so well that in Lombardy no monks were left. Our childhood was not delighted by gifts of pictures and sugar-plums, nor frightened by the sight of long-bearded friars. Monks had no share in our education. They had been banished from every pulpit, from every professional chair; and, when a stray Capuchin appeared in our streets, we all ran to gaze at him, as if he were a Turk or a gipsy.

"This, perhaps, was one reason why we are free from these antipathies which you boast of. . . . We knew that our forefathers had been educated by monks, and we were not absurd enough to consider as brutes such men as Pini, Parini, Amoretti, Fontana, Oriani, Boscowich, Ferrari, Lechi, Verri, Beccaria, Frisi, all of whom were either monks or their pupils.

"Doubtless it was because our native soil was free of monks that it brought forth the Neo-Guelphs! We, the sons of a city destroyed by the Ghibelline leaders, we worshipped that Alexander III. who had put his foot on the neck of the German emperor; we were wont to go as pilgrims to the Convent of Pontida, where was founded the Free League of the Lombard cities,—in that district which has done you thrice in succession the discourtesy of sending you a Catholic member of Parliament.

"These men, in a calamitous period, well satisfied with the silent esteem of all good people, gave themselves up to meditation, to study, to the labor of preparing and seeking lovingly the reign of freedom, which had not yet been made an object of mere speculative admiration. . . . They loved liberty devotedly, not only in hatred of the men who oppressed it, but for its own sake,—for the sake of thinking, speaking, acting, worshipping, praying, solely directed and restrained in this by God and the laws He sanctioned.

"What was my astonishment, on setting foot in Piedmont, to witness people's aversion for the Jesuits, who were looked upon as the Polyphemuses of civilization! And yet, I remember that King Carlalberto, in a conversation I had with him, applauded the reappearance of Guelphic ideas, and the publication of Cesare Balbo's *Life of Dante*. I remember how, at Brussels, Gioberti lauded to the skies the virtues of the Piedmontese clergy, at the very time that he was writing his *Primato d'Italia*. And this choice band of men (the Neo-Guelphs), who only lived to foster in their own souls the flame of freedom, the will to establish and to preserve it in the nation,—were reared by monks, and these seeds of liberty which we had sown and developed in republican writings, grew up to sustain, at a later period, the throne of a national king. . . . We prepared for constitutional liberty a robust and



healthy growth. . . . The fruit is before you ; political freedom is ours henceforth. Under its reign there is room for all, for the king as for the priest, for the day laborer as for the millionaire, for the followers of Rothschild as for the Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul. Formerly a *régime* of exclusion prevailed, to-day the road is open to all. Henceforth men are not only free to believe, but free to worship, as they choose. Jews, Catholics, Freemasons,—we are sitting here all together ; we greet each other civilly in the street ; we respect those who keep holy the Sabbath day and those who hallow the Sunday ; we cast our votes together in this Chamber, and we observe toward each other the rules of courtesy and unite in the practice of brotherly charity.”

From this retrospective glance at the Middle Ages, Cantù passed to the actual condition of monastic institutions in both hemispheres. He recalls to the Chamber the perfidious advice given, in 1827, to the English Government by an Italian nobleman, Count Ferdinand del Pozzo,—who did not want to see the Irish Catholics emancipated, and warned Wellington and Peel against granting liberties which would be turned to ill use, and which Catholic Austria would not grant to its own subjects.

“The English thought otherwise,” the speaker continued, “and the world at present knows that the greater the advance in liberty made by England and her daughter, the great American republic, the more liberal are they toward religious associations. In both countries, Mormons, Moravians, and Barnabites are equally free. More than that,—because Quakers are conscientiously opposed to war, they are dispensed from military service. This little minority among two great nations is treated, as you see, with more respect than you show to the Catholic majority in Italy.

“ . . . In the United States the Church is entirely separated from the State. Every denomination supports its own ministers and worship. Every infraction of the law is punished by the civil magistrate. Will you ever have the courage to adopt so full a measure of freedom ? The President of that republic (Lincoln) has a salary of 100,000 lire, after having begun his life as a woodsman. But, in every great calamity he proclaims a day of public prayer, and all hasten to address their supplications to God.

“On the contrary, among peoples who know nothing of progress but revolutionary agitations, you will see them always beginning by the suppression of convents and the sequestration of ecclesiastical property. In Greece, in the Danubian principalities, in Mexico, and at this moment in Russia, nuns are driven forth from their convents because they say their prayers in Latin, and weep for the oppression of their native land.

“Our government is now printing documents, skilfully chosen,

to cast dishonor on Charles III. of Parma; and, among other wrong-doings attributed to him, he is accused of having expelled the Benedictines from Parma and the Lazarists from Piacenza."

Cantù felt, while thus attempting to shame the Italian revolutionists into some fair show of tolerance and moderation, that he was attempting the impossible. A man whose writings, whose sufferings, whose life of poverty and abnegation were all inspired by a consistent love and pursuit of liberty in its truest and widest sense, could successfully challenge the sincerity of the intolerant, persecuting, and irreligious mob who followed Cavour and Ratazzi. They hated and respected at the same time the courageous Neo-Guelph and the pure and incorruptible patriot.

Then, as the Italian Parliament and the advancing revolution became still more and more anti-Catholic, Pius IX. issued his famous prohibition, *Nè eletti nè elettori*; Catholics were neither to vote nor to allow themselves to be voted for.

Cantù, as well as his eloquent colleague, Count d'Ondes-Reggio, at once resigned his seat in Parliament, although questioning, as did very many sincere Catholics, the wisdom of the Pontifical prohibition, which left both Houses of Parliament,—or at least the Lower House,—without a single voice to defend the Catholic interests of Italy.

There was, however, much to say in favor of this absolute *abstention* under the then existing circumstances. The formula adopted by Pius IX. had been first used by the Abbate Margotti, the eloquent founder of the *Armonia*, of Turin, and the *Unita Cattolica*. This courageous priest had been duly elected to Parliament; but his election had been annulled without any other reason save that of Margotti's being a Catholic journalist and an opponent of the revolutionary majority. Cantù's election had been thrice annulled for a similar reason, in face of the unanimity and enthusiasm with which the great historian had been elected. Cantù had not allowed himself to be discouraged, but went again to the polls, was elected, and presented himself once more before Parliament, which was shamed into ratifying his election. Not so Margotti. He never asked for another vote; but denounced, with a power and an eloquence that thrilled all Italy, the brutal tyranny which had usurped the name and forms of a constitutional monarchy.

There was not in reality, save in a very few places, anything like freedom in polling votes. The men who dared to vote for a Catholic became at once the objects of a most bitter persecution, and not unfrequently ran very serious risks. In Parliament itself there was no freedom of discussion. An irresistible revolutionary current, set in movement by the majority, hurried both Houses to-

ward measures which it was vain to protest against. The presence of a few Catholic members only seemed to give an indirect sanction to laws which aimed at overturning all religion.

Then, as one State after another was swept into the "Kingdom of Italy," and among them the States of the Church, the former subjects of the Pope and the other lawful princes had scruples about taking the parliamentary oath, and thereby recognizing what they justly regarded as a usurpation. These scruples became still greater after 1870, when Rome itself became the capital of the new kingdom.

At the accession of Leo XIII., however, when it had become clear that the revolution was an accomplished fact, and that the existing political institutions were not likely to be overturned, all far-sighted Catholics in Italy began to ask themselves whether it were not wiser to use the ballot-box for the purpose of electing to municipal and parliamentary offices the very best men they could find, so as to resist the enactment of anti-Catholic legislation, and to repeal by degrees the disastrous existing laws against the Church and the Pope.

No sooner had the new Pontiff been crowned than he at once summoned to Rome Cesare Cantù. The latter had been singularly honored by Pius IX. at the assembling of the Vatican Council. He was appointed historian of the Council, and, as such, was the only layman admitted to all the private deliberations. This was a supreme approbation given to the life and labors of the invincible defender of Catholic principles,—to the courageous leader of the Neo-Guelphs, who still professed their faith and kept alive their hope in a Catholic and Papal Italy amid the triumph of their adversaries.

Leo XIII. at once asked the historian if some plan could not be devised of reconciling the sacred and inviolable rights of the Holy See with the exercise of citizenship under the kingdom of Italy. To devise some such conciliatory scheme, Cardinal Franchi and Cantù at once set to work. "You can imagine our delight," the latter writes, "when everything thus promised to be settled. . . . But thereupon Cardinal Franchi died, and there was an end to our negotiations."

At any rate, the attempt proved that the great mind of Leo XIII. saw clearly the irreparable injury done to religion in Italy by allowing the current of national life to flow on, generation after generation, controlled by the exclusive forces of an anti-Christian revolution. The lawful use of the ballot-box, and the putting of Catholics into every office where they can control education, legislation, and administration, would seem the only present practical



remedy for an evil which increases with each year, and threatens to become irremediable.

On returning to private life Cantù resumed with incredible ardor his literary labors. Omitting his minor publications, we need only mention some of the great works which have proceeded from his unwearied pen since he abandoned parliamentary life. In 1867 appeared his "History of the Heretics of Italy," a masterpiece which fills a void in ecclesiastical history. His history of Italian independence, in three large volumes, bears the title of *Cronistoria*, because narrating and describing events which were passing under his eyes, and with which he was himself mixed up, he performs the part of chronicler as well as that of historian. The work is full of anecdotes and personal souvenirs, which lend to it a great charm, and give it additional authority. In 1879 was published his *Storia di Trent' Anni*. And, as we write, the first volume of the tenth edition of his Universal History comes to us in semi-monthly numbers.

Through all these years the Christian education of youth never ceased to hold a foremost place in the heart of Cesare Cantù. Foreseeing the deplorable changes which the Freemason ministry of the French Republic were about to make in all the colleges and schools, Cantù, who is a corresponding member of the French Academy of Moral Sciences, wrote to his colleague, M. Parieu, the following admirable letter :

"SIR: There is a question far more important than the unity of the currency (about which I consulted your well-known competency); a question of the most extreme urgency, which interests both your country and mine, and the whole civilized world. You will understand me to allude to the liberty of teaching.

"The battle has long been carried on about this matter. It will soon be transferred to the French Senate, where, I feel certain, you will, as ever, show yourself devoted to the cause of liberty.

"We could never bring ourselves to believe that one Republic in France could oppose the free rivalry between schools, tear to pieces the educational charter given by another Republic, that of 1848, and deprive France of the educational liberty conquered in 1850.

"Here in Lombardy, during what they call the age of tyranny, under the Austrian rule, we had not this liberty, and the government kept a close watch on ecclesiastical education. One may conceive such things to exist under the successors of Joseph II. I therefore wrote on this subject a memoir crowned by the Academy of Modena.

"As soon as the Kingdom of Italy was inaugurated, the Casati

Law gave us liberty to teach, and affirmed the authority of every father of a family over his children's education.

"Later on, however, those who maintained the policy of Cavour omitted no exertion to restrain that liberty. They were impelled by one very evident motive, the fear of the clergy, whom they were wont to hold up to all as the worst enemies of Italy.

"At present the great majority of Italians, who are devoted to the noble cause of Christian education, are anxious to build up a barrier against the torrent of materialistic ideas and selfish passions which prey upon the souls of youth. Those, on the other hand, who love this calculated corruption make a furious war on all schools which unite, in their teaching, the love of God to that of country and science.

"They starve out the ecclesiastical schools; they have confiscated the revenues of our seminaries and the property of our Bishops. The Holy Father (in an audience which he recently granted to me) complained to me that, at the very time when he feels the need of raising the education of priests to the lofty standard required by criticism and apologetics in our day, all means of doing so were taken away from him. This is the method of persecuting followed by Julian the Apostate.

"Are these the models that your Republic is about to follow? If lay establishments of education are afraid of the opposition of ecclesiastical, or rather Catholic, schools and universities, this is to confess that the education given in the latter is acknowledged to be the best, and is therefore supported by the majority of the nation.

"What a powerful encouragement is here for the men who, like yourself, resist the inundation of evil, in the applause of so many French parents and in the crusade which all good fathers are carrying on against this conspiracy of hatred!

"What an admirable spectacle is offered by the zealous exertions of the Episcopacy to counteract this disturbance of your religious peace—a peace as sadly needed in your country as in mine!

"Their courage, their unanimity shall serve as a good lesson to the Catholic party in Italy, who have condemned themselves to a fatal *abstention* from all political acts.

"We have been shouting: Let there be light, and let us perish! . . . Now we turn our eyes toward the French Republic, where you, sir, and your friends are going to show us how liberty can be conservative, while it is progressing and while aiming to achieve a purpose that is far above the accident of a monarchical or a republican form of government.

"Accept, my dear colleague, the expression of my feelings of respect and friendship,

"CESARE CANTÙ.

"MILAN, May 21st, 1879."

And here, for the moment at least, we leave this great life, so full of glorious performance, and still at its close so full of indefatigable and fruitful energy. One incident only we wish to mention here, and we are sure the young men who read this page, if not their elders, will be grateful to him who records it here.

On the 16th of last March the citizens of his native town of Brivio placed with great solemnity, on the wall of the house in which the great historian was born, a medallion portrait in his honor, with the inscription: *A Cesare Cantù vivo*—"To Cesare Cantù in his lifetime." This was in violation of the rule of art which he had laid down—that no living man should allow a statue or any similar monument to be erected in his honor. So spontaneous was the movement of the entire population, desirous of testifying their love and reverence to one so dear and so illustrious, that Cantù was induced to be present and to address the multitude.

"The dream which I had cherished in childhood," he said, "of spending an obscure existence in this lowly dwelling with my ten brothers and sisters, did not last long. Nor did that other dream of coming back to it, after more than one furious storm, as to the harbor where I should end my life, unenvied and unenvying, forgotten and forgetting.

"These accidents, which, if they do not force our will, at least direct it, have also kept me still separated from this spot where I was born, where lived my aged parents and their fathers before them, and a long series of ancestors who have left behind an honored memory.

"Still, although far away and busied with other thoughts and cares, I have never allowed my thoughts or my eyes to lose sight of my native country; and those who have read my books (too numerous, it may be, but not one of which gives me a pang of remorse) know how often I recall my own Brivio, our beautiful lake (Como), these mountains—whose every line we are as familiar with as with the features of our next neighbors, . . . the castle—all covered with shrubs and creeping-plants as with the mantle of a new life, the church where I have so often served Mass and joined in those sweet chants, those sublime rites which consecrate both our life and our death.

"And you made me a grateful return of kindness and good wishes, and you were heard to mention the name of him who, far



from you, 'and all alone with his courage and his hopes,' persevered obstinately in worshipping the True, the Beautiful, the Good; and perhaps you felt some pleasure in saying: He belongs to my native place.

"On other occasions, particularly when you followed me to the grave of my brother Ignatius, I expressed the wish to wait for the Resurrection in the cemetery where sleep my old parents, and so many good souls whom I have known, and my old schoolmates, only one of whom, perhaps, is now living, the man so dear and so honored by us all (Giosue Magni).

"But as death seems to forget me, you have wished to burn here in advance a grain of that incense which is only burned over the coffin of the dead.

"My own emotion blesses you for it, and thus you have enabled me to thank you.

"Therefore, oh, dear fellow-countrymen, whenever you may happen to show yonder portrait and this little house to your young people, you can also say to them: 'Beginning from a lowly station and with very scanty means, that man succeeded in honoring our native place by being true to his convictions, by respecting good sense and the dignity of manhood, by being ambitious, not of honors, but of HONOR, by persisting to think and to work. You, boys, can do the same, and your native spot will respect and love you.'"

---

## CATHOLIC FREE SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES.

### THEIR NECESSITY, CONDITION, AND FUTURE.

*Fifth Annual Report of the Diocesan School Board, Diocese of Fort Wayne, Indiana, to Right Rev. Joseph Dwenger, D.D., for Scholastic Year 1882-83, July 26th, 1883. Fort Wayne, Indiana. 8vo., 95 pp.*

**H**ALF a century ago, in this country, it was deemed a duty of parents to give their children such training or education in school as their means and position permitted; and besides this, charity called upon the classes more favored with the goods of this world to afford to the children of the poorer or less thoughtful portion of the community such training in morality and the rudiments of education as would save them from becoming a burthen and a curse to society, and enable them, with ordinary exertion, to become creditable members of the commonwealth.

Religion was the underlying element of all education. The colleges and higher academies of the country were almost without exception created and controlled by the various religious denominations, and the schools for the education of the poor, then well styled, from the greatest of Christian virtues, charity schools, were nearly all maintained by the churches, New York having, in addition, a society formed expressly to look after the children of those whose parents were not under the influence of any of the recognized churches, known as the Public School Society.

The State governments encouraged all educational efforts; charters and grants had, from an early period, been made to Episcopalian, Congregational, Presbyterian, Dutch Reformed, and other sectarian colleges, academies, and schools. So long as the young received a suitable training, it was not deemed prejudicial, but, on the contrary, desirable, that each denomination should at the same time, according to its recognized faith, imbue the minds of children in their flock with the sound principles of religion and morality.

In no part of the country was the education more completely religious than in New England. Nowhere were the church and state more closely united or interwoven. Every town had its Congregational meeting-house, and its school under the control of the church, and every citizen was taxed to maintain both. Fifty years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence it was still held

that people of all denominations were liable to be taxed in order to maintain the Congregational meeting-house, and no one ventured to question the right of the town to tax all to maintain the Congregational school. All the New England colleges were originally strictly Congregational, and throughout the whole New England system, from the Dudleyan Lectures in Harvard to the New England Primer in the village school, the training was religious and sectarian. It sought to inculcate morality and religious doctrine according to the doctrines of the Westminster Confession of Faith. In other parts the church support and church-school support were voluntary. In New England they were compulsory. At the commencement, and for many years, all were required by law to attend as well as maintain the Congregational meeting-house and school, and though the state ultimately yielded on the point of attendance at the meeting-house, and very recently on the point of maintaining the same, they never yielded one iota as to the maintenance of the Congregational schools.

So intimate was the connection between the Congregational church and the district school that it was not always easy to draw the line between them. At this very moment a case is on trial in Connecticut to decide whether the district school at Bridgeport owns itself or whether it belongs to the Congregational society.

The case of Thoreau, a New England writer not long dead, shows how late the state-church theory was upheld; for, though he never set foot in the meeting-house, he was technically deemed to belong to it, and was actually imprisoned for refusing to pay his church-rates.

The principle of New England really was, and is, that any sect or combination of sects able to obtain control has the right to enforce in the schools maintained by general tax its own or their common religious views.

That such a principle is in harmony with the sound principles of liberty on which the Constitution of the United States and of the States generally rest, few, we think, would venture openly to maintain; yet, in fact, legislative and governmental action is every day based upon it.

New England, in time, broke away to some extent from the fetters of Congregationalism, but it is a melancholy fact that the minds of the people tended almost irresistibly not to reject the great Calvinistic errors, but to add a greater one by denying the divinity of our Lord, and, step by step, to deny the whole Christian system and the existence and providence of God.

But the machinery of meeting-house and school went on—a settled part of the work of the Commonwealth. Under the new tendency of the active minds of New England came the idea of using



the school to undermine Christianity as it had been used to uphold Congregationalism, of making education blank and colorless, excluding religion and morality as assiduously from its teachings as they had assiduously been made a paramount element. We have the direct testimony of Doctor Brownson, himself one of the very circle of thinkers, that this was a plan deliberately and carefully considered and formed.

We see the same plan carried out openly and without disguise in France, Belgium, and Italy. Here it was done covertly and by secret agencies, but as surely and systematically.

The denominations gradually took less interest in their schools, and began to rely almost exclusively on State aid. It needed only a pretext, and this would be withheld. The pretext came in New York. The Bethel Baptist church, to secure a larger grant, returned a fictitious number of pupils. The discovery of the fraud created everywhere a feeling against the denominational schools; grants were withdrawn, and nearly all the charity schools connected with churches dwindled away.

As the New England population emigrated to Pennsylvania, western New York, Ohio, and the territory beyond, they carried their system, and the new towns had a gospel lot and a school lot. The old religious element would have soon died out had not the Bible been taken as a school-book. Noah Webster, in one of his earlier essays, took strong ground against the use of the Bible in schools, a custom which, according to him, arose from the paucity of books. The lack of readers made it convenient to employ as a reading-book a volume to be found in almost every house.

The Bible got into the schools and remained, used by pupils as a reading-book in some places; in others, by the teacher, who read a portion as the text of a kind of homily.

Amid all this gradual change in the character of the schools, and the direct project for the exclusion of religion from them, the Catholic body in the United States, comparatively poor and scattered, adhered to their Church schools.

Catholic churches can scarcely be said to have existed here before the Revolution, but in the records of our earliest churches, as they arose, are evidences that with almost every one a school was connected, if not from the outset, at least from a very early period. Where the State encouraged their efforts to educate, the poor, Catholics accepted their share gratefully; where it was denied, they labored on, doing all their straitened circumstances permitted. They could not meet all the necessities of the case. Many Catholic children attended the Public School Society's establishments in New York, as well as the district schools in the country. The school-books forty years ago teemed with insulting and mendacious state-

ments against Catholics, as well as with doctrinal statements which the adherents of the ancient faith could not accept. The attempt of Catholics to obtain a modification of these, so that their children should not be compelled to study and repeat doctrine which they considered false, or statements which presented them in a hateful and disgraceful character, was not met in a kindly spirit. Minds imbued with the tradition of three centuries of anti-Catholic falsehood could not easily admit, even indirectly, that they had been deluded. If they sincerely believed that every Catholic was an idolater, an enemy of God and man, that his religion justified all sin, that priests sold absolution, and the like, was not this sufficient reason why every Catholic child in a public school should, under pain of expulsion, be required to learn as a lesson and repeat that he was an idolater, etc.? Such was their reasoning.

A bitter anti-Catholic feeling was engendered. A small but active body of fanatics, by working upon this, contrived to pervert and falsify the American conscience. They assumed, and you find them to this day assuming, that they, and they alone and exclusively, constitute the American people. They talked, and there are some yet idiotic enough to talk, of *their* granting Catholics this and that, as though Catholics did not grant them liberty just as really as they granted it to Catholics. The simple fact that the American people comprises Protestant, Catholic, Jew, and men of other religions is studiously ignored and kept out of view. Assuming that they, a few fanatics, and those who followed their lead, were, by some mysterious process, the depositaries of all power, they proceeded to state to their fellow-citizens how much of life, liberty, and happiness it was their sovereign pleasure they should enjoy.

A clear, logical statesman would have then built a plan by which every citizen could obtain for his children the highest possible education, with such religious training as he preferred. But a wretched compromise was attempted, and this is the system which has gained in several States, and is talked of as national. The old religious and moral teaching is abandoned. An eminent ecclesiastic from England was struck with this feature and remarked upon it. The *Journal of Education* denied the fact positively and indignantly, yet either voluntarily or blindly it made an assertion which it could not prove. Not even the Ten Commandments are now taught in schools, and there is certainly no text-book of religion or morality used in the schools, no course of lessons which is distinctly devoted to the inculcation of either. To talk of a religious and moral spirit pervading the whole system is mere nonsense; the very text-books now are colorless compared to those of half a century ago.

Yet, in establishing the new system of schools on the New England plan, deprived of the religious element, something had to be conceded to the fanatical element. Forty years ago the miscreants who burned the Catholic churches in Philadelphia made great professions of attachment to the Bible. The volume was paraded in all their processions; Catholics were held up as enemies of the Bible, and a perfunctory reading of the Bible was insisted upon as part of the school exercises. By Bible, of course, they meant a Protestant translation of a Protestant-arranged text of those books only in the Protestant canon. School was to be opened with prayer of Protestant type, and the exercises enlivened by Protestant hymns.

This made the schools such as Catholics could not accept; and while pupils were thus constantly imbued with Protestant ideas, and taught to accept them as the only true system, all direct moral teaching was arrested.

To this day it is a matter depending on caprice whether the Catholic or Jewish child who is absent from school, on a holiday obligatory by the rules of the church, can be expelled or mulcted with demerits for his conscientious absence. The schools are treated as Protestant, and all and everything not in harmony with Protestant ideas is matter of punishment.

After the agitation of the school question, now nearly half a century since, it became evident to Catholics that if their children were to be imbued during their school days with morality and religion, it must be in Catholic schools, established and supported by Catholics themselves.

The schools supported by the State were really an engine of proselytism to which the State weakly yielded. American liberty there received a serious wound. When, in so vital a matter as education, the rights, the wishes, the petitions of a portion of the community numbered by thousands and constantly increasing were set at naught, and the power of the State tamely transferred to a coalition of sects for their oppression, every principle for which our ancestors contended in 1776 was abandoned.

As we have remarked, the free school connected with the Church dates back in this country to the last century, but these establishments had not kept growth with the churches, and received comparatively little attention. The earliest of the series of Catholic almanacs, that issued for the year 1833, makes no allusion whatever to the charity or free schools then maintained by the Catholic body; the next year only three are mentioned, one in Baltimore, another in Boston, and the third in New York. The next year only six are reported; seven in 1836, nine in 1837. In 1841 we can see that attention was aroused, and that the schools were in-



creasing in number and efficiency, eight being enumerated in New York city alone. Yet, even in 1844, when a powerful political party was organized to deprive Catholics of their constitutional rights in the matter of education, and make them the bondmen of their religious antagonists, the annual record does not show twenty-five free schools maintained by them.

The earliest schools were under lay teachers, the Sisters of Charity being the first religious community which gave their services to the cause of gratuitous education. By 1850 the Catholic body was aroused to the necessity of making sacrifices to erect and maintain suitable schools, and dioceses in several parts of the country had introduced religious communities devoted especially to school work. Nearly fifty schools are mentioned, and we find the Brothers of the Christian Schools, Brothers of St. Patrick and St. Joseph, as well as the Sisters of Charity and St. Joseph, in charge of Catholic free schools.

The schools needed not only trained teachers, such as they were now obtaining, but text-books. The first attempts were made by reprinting works issued on the other side of the Atlantic, Andrews's Catholic School-book, Challoner's *Bible History*, the series of readers prepared by the Christian Brothers in Ireland. The histories and geographies used were those published in this country, full as they were of prejudice, and statements either false or malicious.

Though the First Council of Baltimore, in 1829, had taken action on these points, the progress in twenty years had not been great. The thirty-fourth decree of that council says: "We deem it absolutely necessary that schools be established in which the young may be taught the principles of faith and morals while they are instructed in letters." The thirty-fifth decree looked to the preparation of suitable school-books: "Since it not seldom happens that many things are found in the books generally used in schools in which the principles of our Faith are assailed, our doctrines misrepresented, and history itself perverted, so that the minds of the young are imbued with error, to the most grievous injury of souls, zeal for religion, a due education of youth, and the honor of the United States demand that so great an evil be remedied. For this reason, we ordain that, as soon as possible, books shall be issued for the use of schools, completely purged from errors, and approved by the judgment of the bishops, in which nothing is contained that can inspire hatred or ill-will towards the Catholic Faith."

In 1840, however, so little had been accomplished that the Fourth Council of Baltimore, as though the position taken ten years before had been rash and unavailing, looked in its sixth de-

cree rather to exertions to make the public schools available by obtaining exemption for Catholic children from participation in the Protestant prayers and hymns and Bible reading.

When, ten years later, a right spirit had been aroused, the Fathers of the First Plenary Council of Baltimore, convened in 1852, in their thirteenth canon, show how deeply the cause of Christian education had taken root in their hearts. "We exhort the bishops, and, in view of the immense evil resulting so generally from a want of proper education among the young, we implore them, by the bowels of God's mercy, to see that schools are established in connection with every church in their diocese, and if necessary, and the condition of affairs allow, provide that suitable teachers be obtained, to be maintained from the income of the church to which the school is annexed." All hope was lost that the State would ever recover the control of the public schools from the hands of the anti-Catholic fanatics to which it had surrendered them, or ever take steps to make education Christian. The council recognized the fact that the public schools, whether intensely Protestant or utterly Agnostic and Godless, must ever be a powerful engine in the war of error against Catholic truth.

Archbishop Hughes had not long before, in a circular to the clergy and laity of his diocese, uttered words that have become memorable, and were the motto of the new Catholic impulse: "It may not be out of place to urge upon you the necessity of providing for the primary education of your children in connection with the principles of our Holy Religion. I think the time is almost come when it will be necessary to build the school-house first, and the church afterwards. Our fellow-citizens have adopted a system of general education which, I fear, will result in consequences to a great extent the reverse of those which are anticipated. They have attempted to divorce religion, under the plea of excluding sectarianism, from elementary education and literature. There are some who seem to apprehend great mischief to the State if the children in our public schools should have an opportunity of learning the first elements of the Christian doctrine in connection with their daily lessons. Happily, they require of us only to contribute our portion of the expense necessary for the support of this system. . . . I shall not lose any opportunity that may offer of promoting the prospective purpose here indicated of providing Catholic education for Catholic children."

Under the impulse thus given, schools were begun at the greatest sacrifice, every parish that was able to struggle with its burdens assuming the additional charge of maintaining a free school. It is not possible, of course, here to trace the progress year by year. The immense stride may be seen in the fact that, in the

diocesan reports for 1860 there are specifically mentioned 365 parochial schools, with about 45,000 pupils, although for many important dioceses, such as New York, which had 39 parochial schools, and Newark, the number of pupils was not returned. There were, so far as we can judge, nearly 500 schools and 70,000 pupils. In these the boys were under the care of Brothers of the Christian Schools, Brothers of Mary, Brothers of the Holy Cross, Brothers of the Third Order of St. Francis, and the girls under Sisters of Charity of various branches, Sisters of Mercy, of the Holy Cross and of St. Joseph, School Sisters of Notre Dame, Ursulines, Ladies of the Sacred Heart, Visitation Nuns, and Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis.

By this time attempts had been made to give the parochial schools Catholic Readers, and histories as well as catechisms for more advanced classes. The Readers, prepared by the Sisters of the Holy Cross, were a vast improvement on anything yet presented, and they were widely and beneficially used.

The danger of schools from which religion is excluded, and the necessity of erecting Catholic schools and placing them under religious teachers if possible, is set forth in an Instruction from the Sacred Congregation *De Propaganda Fide*: "All care is to be taken to found Catholic schools where they are needed, or to enlarge them, and fit and organize them more perfectly, so as to equal in efficiency and discipline the public schools. To effect this holy and necessary design, the employment of members of religious communities will contribute greatly, and that the expense of this most necessary work be freely and abundantly supplied by the faithful, it is very necessary that pastors, at a seasonable opportunity, either in pastoral letters, sermons, or private conversation, make known that they would be grossly derelict in their duties if they did not with all care provide for Catholic schools."<sup>1</sup>

After this, the progress of the parochial schools was wonderful; clergy and people united. What would have been deemed utterly beyond the means of the Catholic body was effected, and, like all that has been done in this country, by the constant small contributions of the many. In not a single case that has reached our notice has a school been founded or endowed by an individual. Ireland is dotted with the ruins of convents and monasteries, most of which were founded and endowed by individuals in the Ages of Faith. Spain, France, Belgium, Italy, Germany, show similar foundations; it is a reproach to the Catholics of the United States that their body has produced so few men actuated by large and charitable impulses that spring from faith. Yet, though the paro-

---

<sup>1</sup> *Instructio S. C. de Propaganda Fide, Syn. Dioc. Neo Ebi. IV., p. 48.*



chial schools were thus dependent for their creation and maintenance on the liberality of those on whom God had bestowed less in the matter of worldly goods, their number had risen in 1875 to 1444; in 1876, it rose to 1645; in 1879, to 1958; and in 1880, to 2246, with 405,234 pupils. At the commencement of the present year, 1884, the Catholic body in the United States, according to the statistics furnished by the several dioceses, taxed as they were to maintain State schools, which they could not conscientiously use for the education of their children, maintained 2532 parochial schools, in which the immense number of 481,834 children were educated. The late venerable and illustrious Pontiff Pius IX. had said: "We must make education Catholic;" certainly, the world has never witnessed so much accomplished in so short a time and at such sacrifices. The Catholic Almanac of 1834 records but three parochial schools; that of 1884, 2532, and nearly half a million of pupils. The total average attendance at the State sectarian schools in 1880 was 5,805,342 in a total population of fifty millions, a little over ten per cent.; while the Catholic community of eight millions had in its own free schools half a million, or nearly seven per cent. A few years will make the Catholic rate exceed that of the State school.

This wonderful growth was not under any general organization; each parish acted by itself, under the guidance of the pastor, on whose zeal all depended. Beside his other duties, he was forced to become builder, financier, and furnisher. When his school was open for pupils he was school superintendent; teachers were to be secured; a course of studies planned; school books introduced. If he could secure some members of a teaching order either for the boys or the girls, a great responsibility was taken from him, as he could confide his school safely to a body recognized and approved by his bishop; if he could not obtain religious Brothers or Sisters, he was forced to become examiner of the applicant for the position of teacher, and decide on the ability and fitness of the teacher as a guide for Catholic youth, and, of course, exercise a constant personal supervision.

The rapidity with which the schools increased taxed to the utmost the teaching orders; none could meet all the calls made upon them. Numerous as vocations were, members could not be formed to supply teachers for anything like the number that desired them. New teaching orders came from abroad, from England, Ireland, Belgium, Germany, and France.

The great demand for school-books stimulated publishers to get up series of books for all the different classes, and the competition led to a great improvement in the manufacture of our school-books, their typography, illustrations, etc. Even a Protestant pub-

lishing house adapted some of its books for Catholic schools by suppressing part of the plates and introducing Catholic matter, issuing the works thus modified under a name already known to Catholics. Competition between these publishers created difficulties; books already used for a time in classes would be given up in exchange for those issued by another house, which, like Aladdin's magician, gave new for old, with a view to future patronage. Such changes, and they were frequent, could not fail to exercise an injurious influence on the classes.

As each parish acted for itself, the classes were graded, and books introduced according to the standard of that parish, and four or five parochial schools in the same city, or in districts that touched each other, would have as many systems of teaching and as many sets of school-books. This, in old parishes in Europe, where little change takes place from year to year, would have been far less hurtful than here. In this country the workman changes his abode to be near his work, and the parents of a large majority of the children in our parochial schools are subject to frequent change. It becomes very burthensome to the parent who is forced to remove from one parish to another, to be compelled to purchase a new set of books at each new school, and discouraging to find that his child, graded by one system in one place, is put in a lower class in another school, where pupils were graded by a different study.

Hence it is clear that, now that the great bulk of schools immediately required have been established, and the people become accustomed to maintain them as they ungrudgingly do, steps must be taken to make the system of parochial schools permanent by introducing order into the vast collection of schools in each diocese. A school board with a superintendent to whom each bishop may commit the general management of parochial schools seems to have become an imperative demand. Such a body, under the direction of the archbishop or bishop of the diocese, could establish the grades for classes in all the schools; and, by a careful examination of all the available text-books, decide after obtaining the practical verdict of experienced teachers as to their degrees of merit when tested by actual use, and then establish a list of books to be used in all the schools of the diocese. This will relieve the parish priest of a burthen and responsibility, and deliver him from the importunity of publishers. It will give uniformity in the course of studies throughout a considerable district, and make the transfer of a pupil from one school to another a matter causing little difficulty to teacher or pupil.

This great step has not been the subject of legislation in any of the provincial or plenary councils yet held; but is one that

must soon be acted upon, to insure the permanency and success of our Catholic system. That men of wealth will, actuated by the spirit of former days, help to create diocesan school funds, all will most earnestly desire and pray, though there is little to encourage us to expect any immediate result.

The Catholic schools occupied the attention of the fathers of the second Plenary Council, who, in Title IX., renew the condemnation of the godless schools maintained by the State as destructive of the faith of Catholics, exhort pastors where possible to establish parochial schools, and, where this is impossible, to counteract, by assiduous instruction of the young in Christian doctrine, the infidel or vague and indifferent ideas inculcated in them by the mistaken system of the State schools. They urge the pastors to confide the parochial schools to teaching orders where possible; and when none can be obtained, to select teachers with the utmost care. The preparation of suitable text-books was also considered.<sup>1</sup>

The first Council of Cincinnati (14) urged the erection of parochial schools, and the statutes of the diocese (ch. viii., sect. 2) and those of Fort Wayne (53, 54) enjoin on priests the due care and direction of them. The third Council of New Orleans, in 1873 (Dec. v., p. 20), urged the erection of parochial schools, and in an especial manner of schools for the instruction of colored children; the second Council of San Francisco, in 1883 (Dec. v.), enjoins that when a church is completed, the school should be erected and placed under the care of religious. The erection of schools, or where it is impossible, extraordinary exertions to save and instruct Catholic children, are urged in the constitutions of the diocese of Boston, 1868 (Tit. III., 29); statutes of the diocese of Pittsburg, 1869 (ch. v., 2); in the synod of Buffalo, 1871 (ch. xiii., 1); of Louisville, 1874 (ch. ix., 3); in the Decreta of Green Bay, 1877 (viii.); in the statutes of Newark, 1878 (12), and the prompt payment of teachers is there specially enjoined (148).

In the diocese of Fort Wayne a diocesan school board has been established, which, in July, 1883, made its fifth annual report. The board consists of eleven priests and a reverend secretary. It has drawn up a list of school-books deemed suitable for use; regulated the course of study to be pursued in the parochial schools; divided the diocese into districts, so as to be conveniently visited by members of the board, and adopted regulations in regard to the qualifications of teachers and changes to be made in the persons holding the position of instructors. Each district is visited by a member of the board once or twice a year. The reports are printed and distributed among the people to keep alive interest in the schools.

---

<sup>1</sup> Concilium Plen. Balt. II. pp. 218-225.



The confusion arising from a multiplicity of text-books is thus avoided, and uniformity in the method of instruction secured. As similar boards are established, meetings of representatives from them, by conferring as to the results attained, will lead by the experience thus gathered to still greater progress and efficiency in the great national Catholic school organization. The system adopted in this diocese has already been productive of great good in increasing the efficiency of the schools and lightening the labor of the teachers. It can scarcely fail to be generally adapted so as to bring order out of the present confusion, which was unavoidable from the circumstances under which most of the schools were begun, by isolated effort, when the parish priest had no one to consult, and no guide or rule of action but such as his own zeal suggested.

The diocese of Milwaukee has a normal school for the training of Catholic teachers; the course of studies for common schools extending to three years, and for those of a higher grade to five. A general establishment of this kind, when a uniform system of instruction and grading of classes is adopted, would give teachers for all dioceses, trained under the same system, and would gradually lead to a harmonious management of our Catholic schools, whether directed by religious or seculars.

We have every reason to be proud of our parochial schools, as they are the fruit of such immense sacrifices on the part of the clergy and people; and we are all interested in everything that will contribute to render them more efficient in saving Catholic children from the ever-increasing dangers to their faith which meet them on every side. The schools are not perfect; there was little time to think of systems; a great want was to be met, and met at once. Buildings have been erected, many of which are superior in construction and arrangement to the vaunted public schools, from which they have drawn away the great majority of Catholic pupils; and in public competitions it has been proved, to the satisfaction of Catholic parents, that their children make better and surer progress in our own schools than they did in those maintained by the State.

In the Exhibition now opened in London, Christian Brothers from this country challenge the world to examine the results of their teaching.

School boards will subserve also another end, and that is to bring our school system favorably to the notice of our more wealthy Catholics. It is not in human nature that they can be so different from their fellow-countrymen who have not received the gift of faith. Yet the list of great donations in life and bequests by will of Protestants for educational purposes which are made

annually in this country, excites deep regret that we cannot produce a similar list of public-spirited men, establishing professorships and scholarships in our colleges, founding and endowing parochial schools, in a word, giving to God's work part of the means God has confided to their hands, not as owners, but as stewards.

---

## THE RECENT AGGRESSIONS OF EUROPEAN POWERS IN ASIA AND AFRICA.

A PECULIAR feature of recent history is the number of purely aggressive wars that have been waged by the Powers of Europe on their less-civilized neighbors. Since the close of the Russo-Turkish War, a passion for foreign conquests seems to have sprung up among European statesmen. Despotie Russia, Republican France, and the Constitutional Monarchy of Great Britain have alike been seized with the desire of enlarging their dominions at the expense of weaker nations. There was a time when civilized governments recognized, in theory at least, the rights of weak states to their existence so long as they gave no cause for attack. Of late, however, these rights seem to be wholly ignored, and the territory of any weak power is looked on as the legitimate prey of any power that covets its possession. The change in the public sentiment of the civilized world, during the last few years, is a startling one. Until a recent period, the distinction between just and unjust wars was fairly well recognized by the conscience of the civilized world. Such deeds as the partition of Poland, or the older Spanish conquest of Naples, were broadly distinguished from the wars resulting from mere national rivalry by the leaders of public thought. The existence of an international law, regulating the relations of independent nations, and protecting the weak against the violence of the strong, was recognized, at least in theory, by all thinking men. That such a public opinion was no slight protection, even in the absence of any tribunal to punish offences against international law, is shown by the prolonged existence in Europe of numerous small states, beside the great powers. Aggressions like the seizure of Strasburg by Louis XIV. have been very rare events, even among the constant wars of which Europe has been the theatre during the last three centuries. During the

years following the close of the Napoleonic wars the public feeling on the side of international law, as opposed to wars of ambition, appeared to be growing rapidly stronger. Indeed, not a few entertained the hope that the increase of intercourse among nations and the diffusion of knowledge would ultimately remove nearly all causes for war, and inaugurate an era of general peace.

Recent events have not borne out such hopes. Not to mention the great wars of the last thirty years on the European continent, the statesmen of Europe have lately been seized with a mania for foreign conquests, which recalls the days of the old Scandinavian vikings. During the last five or six years not less than ten distinctive wars of aggression have been waged in Africa and Asia by European powers. Russia has conquered one and annexed another of the two independent republics of Turkestan. England has seized Egypt on the plea of protecting British interests by occupying the road to India created by the genius of De Lesseps, and has unsuccessfully attempted to conquer the Dutch Republic in South Africa and the tribes of Afghanistan. France, which, a few years ago, so bitterly denounced the injustice of forcing a foreign rule on Alsace-Lorraine, has herself seized on Tunis and Annam, has bombarded Tamatave in Madagascar, and is now trying to exact a ransom from China in much the same fashion as the old Norse pirates levied tribute on Christian France and England a thousand years ago. In all these cases, it is scarcely disguised that the only reason for inflicting the horrors of war on defenceless or ill-armed populations is the desire of seizing their territory. It can hardly be the desire of glory that actuates attacks on such foes, and, indeed, the desire of extending their frontiers seems to be the only justification of any of those little wars which the great powers have put forward. The same plea would justify the deeds of the Algerine corsairs or of the West Indian buccaneers of a former generation. It is not a hopeful sign of modern progress, when its leaders thus return through half the world to a system of lawlessness which was believed to have been swept away as a matter of course by the spread of civilization.

That the policy of the great Powers of Europe has grown distinctively more lawless of late years is a fact which cannot be denied. Fifty years ago the piratical Algerines, whose hand had for ages been against all Christian nations, provoked a French invasion by outrages on Frenchmen, but it was only after satisfaction had been insultingly refused by the Dey that the hostilities were commenced which converted the country into a French province. Within the last five years a dispute between a few nomad tribes on the borders over pasturage was deemed a sufficient excuse to march a French army into Tunis, and oblige the Regent



to hand over his country to the rule of a foreign power. At the other extremity of Africa, England almost at the same time seized on the Transvaal, whose independence she had long formally recognized, without even a pretext of wrong done by the weaker side. The chance that the people of the little Dutch Republic might become involved in wars with their Zulu neighbors was deemed quite reason enough for the government of England to make war on both. The attempt, indeed, was unsuccessful, and a succession of disasters compelled the invaders ultimately to withdraw from both the Transvaal and Zululand; but, in other respects, no difference can be seen between the action of the constitutional government of England in the nineteenth century and that of a Norse pirate king in the ninth. Isolated cases of a similar kind have indeed occurred before in European history. The seizure of Strasburg by Louis XIV. and the bombardment of Copenhagen by Nelson are parallel to the seizure of the Transvaal and of Tunis; but, while such acts happened once in a century formerly, now they have to be chronicled almost every year. As in cities and nations, so in the community of nations there are times when the spirit of lawlessness seems to grow strong and defiant. There is such a thing as international lawlessness as well as international law, and in the old continent the present seems to be essentially a period of international lawlessness.

The moral responsibility for this state of affairs must be equally divided between Russia, England and France. The last named has been also the latest in the field of lawless conquest, and her rulers make no secret of their desire to follow the example of England in India as the sole justification for their policy. Having once decided that honesty is *not* the best policy, the French Republic has thrown itself, even more thoroughly than its rivals in robbery, into the work of seizing on everything that can be seized without danger. The absorption of Tunis was followed by a similar proceeding in Tonquin, where the capital was occupied by a French force, and the king obliged to hand the government of his country over to French officials. The extension of French trade up the Red River was the chief reason which the Paris authorities put forward for thus depriving a population of some twelve millions of their national independence, and for butchering without mercy such as opposed their invasion. If the accounts of correspondents are to be trusted, the French invaders of Tonquin acted at times like a horde of corsairs. No quarter was given to the luckless defenders of their native land, when the foreign invader was able to massacre them. We are told of an Annamite garrison, which had been isolated by the French troops, being obliged to run the gauntlet of a "feu d'enfer," in the vain attempt to escape from their burning

villages, and of the wounded afterwards being bayoneted by the soldiers. It is no excuse for such deeds to say that war excuses them. War has its laws as well as peace, and for over a century at least the massacre of wounded men, or even of a flying or helpless enemy, has been unknown in war among civilized nations. To the French Republic belongs the bad eminence of having, in this respect, re-introduced the war habits of savages among her civilized soldiers.

The ease with which Tonquin had been converted into a French dependency by the agency of rifled cannon and Chassepot guns has only whetted the new French appetite for plunder. Annam had for centuries been a tributary to the Chinese Empire, and the Chinese government naturally protested against the right of France to seize it without indemnity. They soon found that "right" has no meaning in the diplomacy of modern Europe. An attack on China itself was threatened in answer to the Chinese complaints, and finally the timid government at Peking was scared into ceding its rights over Annam without any other equivalent than that of escaping an attack on its defenceless towns. Even that, however, was not granted in exchange for the cession of a territory larger than France itself. The French troops had scarcely waited for the signature of the treaty to occupy the newly acquired country, and at Lung Lou a detachment was refused admission by the Chinese. The commander pleaded that he had received no instructions from his own government to give up the place, a matter quite possible under the circumstances. The French, however, did not retire, and a skirmish ensued in which the invaders suffered some loss, though the garrison, we believe, was afterwards withdrawn. In Europe the affair would have been regarded as an awkward *contratempo* to be settled by at most the dismissal of some officers and the tender of an apology. During the evacuation of France itself by the Germans a similar collision happened, we think, at Verdun, between a French detachment which came to take possession on the departure of the foreigners, and the latter, who had not left as soon as was expected. A slight disturbance occurred, whereon the French were placed under arrest, and the Parisian press admitted the justice of the proceeding on the part of the Prussian commander. In China, however, it was quite another thing, and the Government of Jules Ferry demanded an indemnity of no less than two hundred million francs from China for not having abandoned its own soil to the invaders with sufficient rapidity. As China naturally demurred to this demand, a French fleet proceeded to bombard Foo Chow, and destroy the arsenal there without any declaration of war except the fire of the French artillery. Writers on primitive history tell us that in the early stages of so-

ciety, stranger and enemy were synonymous terms, and that it was only with the advance of civilization that foreigners were recognized as possessing any rights of humanity. The conduct of the French in China would indicate that the law of ancient barbarism is again being adopted by the heads of modern civilization.

The annexation of two such territories as Tunis and Annam in the course of four years has not been enough to satisfy the new greed of France for foreign conquests, where they can be effected without risk. The old Portuguese possessions on the Congo and the independent native tribes of the adjoining country have also had to submit to incorporation with the French dominions. M. De Brazza has been the pioneer of this new aggression, with French gunboats to back him up by force. England and Germany, however, have shown a willingness to take a share in the seizure of West Africa, and consequently some hesitation has been shown in pushing matters too fast in that region. Whatever agreement will be ultimately made between the European powers for the division of the spoil, will probably matter little to the natives, whose rights have as little chance of recognition from Bismarck or Gladstone as from Jules Ferry. As the *London Saturday Review* grimly remarks, the best days of the West African populations have already passed with the advent of European colonization to the Congo. A civilization which recognizes no law but its own greed and its own fears, is not likely to win a plundered and enslaved population from barbarism, and such in all essentials is the character which European culture has now assumed in West Africa.

On the east of the same continent another little war has been commenced with Madagascar. The great African Island has for the last two or three generations been united into a single monarchy which has made commendable efforts to organize the population and establish civilized law throughout the island. Christianity has made considerable progress of late years, and in 1883 the Catholic schools alone were educating nearly twenty thousand children throughout the island. Friendly relations have been maintained with the different European States for many years, and the Hova kingdom is on all principles of right as fully entitled to its independence as Belgium or Switzerland. Unlike the latter, however, Madagascar has no powerful neighbors, on whose jealousy she might rely for protection, and accordingly a short time ago the French took occasion to pick a quarrel. Some speculators had attempted to obtain a grant of public land contrary to the Hova law, and failing in their project, the French officials took up their cause. Tamatave, the chief port of the kingdom, was bombarded about a year ago and subsequently occupied. The principle of seizing territory wherever it could be seized, and slay-



ing the possessors when they objected, was the only apparent motive of this cowardly aggression. M. Jules Ferry in the French Chambers defended the action of his subordinates on the avowed grounds that a civilized power has the right to attack a less civilized one whenever she judges it expedient as a mere matter of police,—in other words, that weak nations have no rights which strong ones are under any obligation to respect, is the rule of foreign policy for the Government of modern France. It has been reserved for our day to see the pirates' code put forward unblushingly by the head of a civilized nation as its standard of morality, and this in the name of morality itself.

While such principles are openly proclaimed by the heads of a nation like France, it need scarcely be wondered at that they should be adopted elsewhere. Russia, during the last twenty years, has been pushing her conquests over Asia with as little scruple as and scarcely less barbarity than her old rivals, the Turks, did in former days. Since 1864 the three Tartar khanates of Khokand, Bokhara, and Khiva, and the two Tekke republics which occupied the district between Afghanistan and the Caspian Sea, have all been reduced under the Government of the Czar. The details of the successive invasions by which a territory of nearly a million of square miles, with a population of eight or ten millions, has been thus deprived of its independence, have not been brought as prominently before the world as those of the French conquests, but the principle actuating them is essentially the same. The nomad Khirgiz tribes were first attacked on the ground that a civilized State like Russia could not tolerate such neighbors; and the better organized khanates were then attacked on the ground of their quarrels with those very nomads. Marauders on the Russian frontier must be conquered for the interests of civilization, but once conquered they must be protected in their quarrels with their more civilized neighbors, for the interests of the empire. Such were the theories alternately put forward by the Russian Chancellor, as the forces of the empire successively attacked the Khirgiz wandering tribes, or the kingdoms of Bokhara or Khiva. In 1864 Prince Gortschakoff, in a circular to the cabinets of Europe, announced definitely that the only object of his sovereign in advancing his frontiers was to bring the wandering tribes under control of a strong government as a matter of self-defence, but that the independence of the civilized States beyond them would be carefully respected.

“Very frequently of late years,” wrote the Prince, “the civilization of the neighboring countries of Asia has been assigned to Russia as her special mission. We are accomplishing the first part of our task in carrying our frontier to the limit where the necessary

conditions (for repressing the nomads) are to be found. The second part we shall accomplish by making every effort to prove to the States adjoining us that Russia is not their enemy, that she entertains no idea of subjugating them, and that peaceful commercial relations with her are more profitable than disorder, pillage, and a chronic state of war.

"The Imperial Cabinet, in assuming this task, has a right to expect that its conduct and principles will be justly appreciated."

There is no mistaking the meaning of this declaration, and yet within the next year Taskend, the largest city of Turkestan, with a population of three hundred thousand, was bombarded and captured, and during the next ten years Khokand, Bokhara, and Khiva were in succession invaded and forced to accept the dominion of the "white Czar." Prince Gortschakoff, in his circular, remarked with touching simplicity that "it is a peculiarity of Asiatics to respect nothing but force, palpable and visible; the moral power of reason and the interests of civilization have as yet no hold on them."

It would certainly be a peculiar view of the "moral power of reason," and the "interests of civilization," that the dwellers of Turkestan could receive from the precepts and practice of their Russian neighbors.

Two examples of the civilization which the invaders had to offer to the conquered tribes will suffice to show its character. The Khirgiz tribes, under a leader named Kutebar Khan, the Abd el Kadir of the steppes, commenced a series of fierce attacks on the Russian outposts in 1853. General Perovsky bribed a nomad chief to murder the daring leader and bring his head to the camp. The plot failed, and for five years the Turcoman chieftain continued to bid defiance to the force and fraud of his civilized foes, who thus applied the "moral power of reason" to further their ends. Still later, in 1881, General Skobeleff, having stormed Akkal Tekke, the capital of Geok Tepe, and captured the women and children of the place, first stripped them of all their ornaments and property, and then by proclamation threatened to abandon them to the licentiousness of his followers, unless their relatives, who were still in arms, should surrender themselves within a given time. Such are the means by which civilization is carried forward in Central Asia in our own day by the arms of Russia.

England, though of late years her aggressions have been less fortunate than those of Russia and France, has been equally regardless of any law except "British interests" in her relations with the weaker powers of Africa and Asia. We have already spoken of the annexation of the Transvaal and the invasion of Zululand without any pretext of injury from either of the peoples thus assailed.

The ambition of the late Earl of Beaconsfield to extend the limits of the empire was the only apparent motive for both raids, and no one was louder in denouncing them than his great rival, Mr. Gladstone. The changes of politics within a few months threw the control of the Government into the hands of the latter, but in this altered state of things he showed no inclination to undo the wrong which he had fiercely denounced. The demand of the Boers for the restoration of their independence was met by despatching fresh troops to maintain the foreign rule imposed on them, and it was only after three defeats, and the death of the British commander, that the English Minister reluctantly conceded the claim whose justice he had so loudly proclaimed a few months before.

The invasion of Afghanistan, after the close of the Russo-Turkish war, is an equally striking example of disregard for national rights. The sovereign of that country had been recognized, in the most formal manner, as an independent ruler, by the English Government. During many years friendly relations had been maintained between the two powers, and the aid of the Afghan Ameer had been sought and obtained by the English Government during the great mutiny. Lord Beaconsfield, however, felt anxious to strike a blow somewhere to counterbalance the prestige which Russia had acquired by the Turkish war, and Afghanistan was considered as a fitting conquest to be attempted. The only alleged grievance was that a Russian envoy had been received in Cabul, and that the Ameer declined to admit an English embassy accompanied by a large military escort. By the common law of nations he was perfectly within the right in both measures, but on the plea that Asiatics recognized no power but force, the English Government deems itself justified in adopting a similar rule for its own conduct, purely in the interests of civilization. A formidable army accordingly invaded Afghanistan, and after a slight resistance occupied its capital, while the Ameer took refuge in a distant province and died shortly afterwards. A British protégé was installed in Cabul, and a British resident with a strong guard left in the capitol, and the conquest of Afghanistan was assumed to be complete. The rising of the natives against the foreigners, the massacre of the resident minister and his escort, the subsequent invasion of the British troops, and the disastrous battles of Cabul and Maiwand followed in close succession. The expenses of the Afghan invasion amounted to a hundred million dollars, and the invaders found it impossible to hold their ground without sacrifices which they were unprepared for; and so, after two years' bloodshed, the country was again abandoned, and a son of the deceased Ameer acknowledged as sovereign of Cabul. The sole reason for the expedition had been British "interests," not



British rights, and its fate was such as wanton aggression richly merited.

The invasion of Egypt is, perhaps, a still more flagrant instance of the disregard of international right. Unlike Afghanistan and Zululand, Egypt has, for many years, held a recognized place among civilized nations. Though nominally a province of Turkey, her practical independence has long been acknowledged both by the Sultan and by the Christian nations of Europe, and her government and administration approached nearer to the standard of European civilization than that of any other Mohammedan state. Indeed, the heaviest burthen on Egypt in recent years has been the usurious interest exacted by her foreign creditors for loans contracted by her rulers for various purposes of improvement. Through various financial manipulations a debt of several hundred million dollars had been piled up in less than twenty-five years, although scarcely half that amount had been actually advanced to the Egyptian treasury. The burden, finally, became unbearable, and even the patient Arab population rose in revolt, and through the mouths of the army demanded a voice in the administration of their government, and a diminution of the unbearable taxes. The Khedive, as many European rulers have done in similar circumstances, bowed to the inevitable and accepted Arabi Pasha, the popular leader, as his minister. Nothing in the whole affair gave any lawful pretext for foreign intervention. The debt was beyond the capabilities of the government to pay, and its partial or total repudiation would have been only what any civilized power would have done, and what in fact many of them have done in similar cases. The European powers had no claim on Egypt, and, if their subjects had invested in Egyptian securities at exorbitant interest, they had done so expressly as private speculators, and that of, by no means, the most reputable kind. England, however, since the completion of the Suez Canal, has been specially anxious to obtain its control. She had thrown all obstacles she could in the way of the enterprise of De Lesseps, but she longed to seize the work which others had accomplished. A street disturbance in Alexandria furnished a pretext for a complaint, and in 1882 a British fleet bombarded and seized that city, and shortly afterwards a British army attacked the luckless Egyptians and took virtual possession of the country. The Khedive was nominally restored, but his government was placed under the control of English officials, and thus by brute force an independent nation was converted into a British province. The subsequent expeditions to the Soudan and the slaughter of the natives at Suakim are deeds whose wanton violence is only paralleled by their aimless blundering. The offer of a bribe by the English Admiral for the murder, by any means, of the chief op-

posed to him shows how the standard of morality in war has retrograded among civilized nations, of late years, at least where civilized armies have ill-armed foes to face.

In the history of the world, as in that of separate nations, there are periods of comparative peace, and others when a spirit of lawlessness seems to take full sway over men. The time of the break-up of the Roman Empire, that of the Norse vikings, and later the early occupation of America, were among the periods when established laws of right seemed to be, for a time, forgotten. Wars and deeds of violence among the nations of European race have to be recorded in every age; but, at such times as we have named, war degenerates into piracy, and nations recognize no law but their own strength. The dealings of the European Powers with the less civilized races during the last few years indicate another period of international lawlessness. The law of the Buccaneers seems to be the only one recognized by most of the statesmen of civilized Europe. An eminent German political writer, the Baron Von Hellwald, in his apology for the Russian policy in Asia, sums up his own ideas thus:

"We do not belong to the whining hypocrites of this age, who have not yet learned the lessons written in history, that the development of mankind or of nations is not accomplished according to any moral law; that the highest ideals must give way to material advantages; that *humanity, freedom, justice, magnanimity, and so many other qualities are but empty words and must unhesitatingly be set aside where it is a question of existence.*"

Baron Von Hellwald is, no doubt, well aware of the sentiments of his friends, when he thus defends their conduct. Nearly two centuries ago Swift mockingly justified the statesmen of his times on such principles as the German publicist now puts forward. It would be hard to find a stronger illustration of the utter corruption of public sentiment than is given by this fact.

In this country, our politicians have had, fortunately, no temptation to assume the character and morals of pirates for the sake of the national interests, and it is to be hoped they never will. The experience of history teaches us that foreign conquests are ruinous to domestic freedom, and, even as a purely temporal matter, we believe that freedom at home is preferable to empire abroad. The spirit of lawlessness is, however, unfortunately as contagious among nations as among men, and we may expect before long to see the piratical expeditions of England and France held up as models before our own aspiring politicians, just as English dress and English manners are proposed for the imitation of our society beaux and belles. It is, certainly, time to point out what in fact are the principles that actuate the civilized governments of Europe to-day,

and what manner of expeditions their "little wars" are. We can find no difference between them and the razzias of the pirates of a former age. Piracy, like slavery, gradually disappeared before the force of Christian public sentiment. It seems to be raising its head again under other names, and it is well that the true character of such measures as the seizure of Tunis and Egypt should be clearly known and branded with the proper title.

It should not be forgotten that politics, like every other field of human action, is subject to the unchangeable law of right. An organized nation has no more right to assail a neighbor for the sake of plunder than an individual has to rob his fellow whenever he feels a desire for his property. It is often said that governments have neither souls to save nor bodies to kill. It is forgotten that a government is made up of intelligent human beings, and that each member of it is responsible before God for his share in its actions. When Las Casas, in the sixteenth century, denounced the cruelties practiced on the Indians by the Court of Spain, he boldly warned Philip II. and his ministers that each of them would have to answer with his own soul for their public, not less than their private, acts. In our days the control of governments has passed, in a great measure, from a few hereditary rulers to the body of citizens. Civil power has its responsibilities as well as its rights, and in a varying degree the warning so solemnly addressed to the Spanish Court is applicable to every citizen of a representative government. Material interests, whether for a nation or an individual, can never be an excuse for wrongdoing. Society itself can only exist by a respect for law among its members, and the rule applies to the society of nations not less than to that of individuals. The recognition of this principle is sufficient to condemn the whole series of aggressions which have formed the ground of these remarks, and which seem to be regarded with such approbation by the public mind of the European world to-day.

---



THE INTERNATIONAL ELECTRICAL EXHIBITION  
OF PHILADELPHIA.

SEPTEMBER 2D—OCTOBER 11TH, 1884.

“The Franklin Institute of Pennsylvania for the promotion of the electrical arts, in pursuance of the object for which it was incorporated in 1824, and in accordance with the history of the organization, has inaugurated another of its periodical exhibitions. This display will be limited to electrical appliances and articles properly associated therewith, and will be the first electro-technical exhibition held in America.”—*Circular of the Franklin Institute of Pennsylvania.*

THE holding of special exhibitions devoted to the interests of electricity seems to have been rendered necessary by the vast strides which this important branch of physical science has taken during the past few years. The number and diversity of electrical inventions are now so great, their use in common life so important and so varied, that no adequate display of them could be made in any merely subordinate section of a general scientific or industrial exhibition. Special exhibitions have therefore been organized of late years at Paris, London, Munich, and Vienna, in which the many inventions connected with electricity may be so compared that some idea of their relative merit and utility can be gained, not by the scientist or practical electrician only, but by the general public as well.

It is with no little satisfaction, then, that we behold our own country, true to the spirit which led it to so materially help on the growth of this science in the past, able at length in our own day to inaugurate a world's electrical exhibition within its own domain. We may add—and we are sure that the feeling is quite a pardonable one—that we are proud of the great event; for the Philadelphia exhibition, if we except the one detail of its arrangement, shows a marked advance not only in the extent of the buildings erected for it, but also in the number, quality, and importance of the exhibits, beyond those of the European capitals mentioned in the beginning. A somewhat thorough examination of the arrangements at Paris in 1881, enables the writer to testify that the opinion uttered some months ago by the Superintendent of construction of the Philadelphia exhibition has been fully verified, and that “it is already certain that the exhibition will, in its importance and extent, excel all its predecessors.” It is to be regretted that the really scientific arrangement of the exhibits which the programme of the Committee would lead one to expect, was not in practice

altogether adhered to, and that the interest of particular houses and individual exhibitors was looked to rather than the convenience of science-loving visitors. We could not help noticing, too, that the exhibition was, in fact, less of an international one than any of those which have thus far been held in Europe. The explanation of this fact is not far to seek. One can easily understand how the difficulties of transportation, and the comparatively small gain to be expected (for,—shall we say the truth?—these things weigh with the exhibitors), should deter European houses from sending their instruments to such a far-off place as Philadelphia. Much more might be said on this point, but it is at present outside of the object of this article, so we pass on.

The opening of an exhibition of such magnitude as that of Philadelphia has suggested to us the expediency of making a short review of the progress made in electricity from its first faint beginnings down to those later and more mature developments which have resulted in the marvellous inventions we are now so familiar with. Of course, in a review of this sort, we shall devote our attention not so much to the details of new instruments as to the principles involved in their construction; some of which are indeed wonderfully utilized. In following out this plan, however, we shall avoid on the one side all mathematical demonstration as well as a too close consideration of merely technical details, while on the other we shall be careful to give more than a bare sketch of the objects exhibited. It is plain, of course, that we cannot include all, nor do all need to be included within the limits of a paper like this. That would be to write a catalogue, and we must disclaim any intention of that sort.

As far as we can call to mind the disposition of the Paris exhibition of 1881, the programme issued by our own of Philadelphia follows, for the most part, the same plan. As we pointed out before, this really excellent arrangement, for some cause or other, was not carried out in apportioning off the spaces allotted to the various exhibits. For the sake of clearness, therefore, we shall be obliged to follow the plan of the programme, and not that of the actual exhibition. There are seven sections. Of these the first three are set apart for the production of electricity, electric conductors, and electric measurements; the fourth, divided again into two sub-sections A and B, comprises the application of electrical currents of high and low tension; while the fifth is devoted to terrestrial physics, and the last two to historical, educational, and bibliographical exhibits. Each of these is subdivided into a certain number of classes, varying according to the requirements of the objects. We shall pass them briefly in review, dealing with them only in so far as they will answer our purpose. As far as possible the chrono-

logical order of discovery will be followed; as in this way a better idea of the gradual advance which has been made in the study of electricity will be had, and the way will be opened to us for a few remarks on the intrinsic nature of this powerful physical agent.

The discovery of electrical phenomena has not been the work of one man, nor of one epoch. It has been brought about by the labor of many generations of scientists, each of them profiting by the discoveries of those already gone before, and thus working in their turn for the men that were to come after them. The seemingly futile and childish attempts of these beginners have been useful to us in more ways than one. They have not merely put us in possession of important knowledge; they have taught us a lesson in scientific methods as well. They have shown us that there is nothing small or of no interest in the physical world. They have taught us to be patient in the study of details which may appear trivial at first, but which may at some not very distant day produce great results. We know, for instance, what apparently insignificant things have led to the present advanced state of chemical knowledge. The long-despised work of the old alchemists opened our eyes to facts which have since served as the starting points for further progress.

The first mention of phenomena now classed as electrical dates from Thales, 600 years before Christ, who speaks of the attraction of amber for light bodies. But although allusions to the same property are not wanting in the following centuries, it was not before Gilbert (1540-1603) that the subject was treated in a manner approaching anything like a truly scientific method. From that time, slowly, as was natural, at first, our knowledge of electricity has ever been on the increase. In the seventeenth century Otto von Guericke perfected, if he did not invent, the first electrical machine, which consisted of a sulphur sphere revolving on an axis and rubbed by the hand. Newton discovered that electrical action was exerted through glass. Then gradually in that and the beginning of the following century came the discovery of the different degrees of conductivity of various bodies with regard to electricity, and of the difference between positive and negative electricity. Inventors also arrived at the form of the rotating frictional machine known as Ramsden's. About the middle of the eighteenth century the Leyden jar and electrical condensation and induction were discovered. It was Epinus, in 1759, who first applied mathematical methods in his investigations of electrical phenomena. Among the foremost scientific investigators of this period was our own Benjamin Franklin, who proved, by the famous experiment of the kite flown in a thunderstorm, the identity of these phenomena with those of electricity. This took place at Philadelphia. The laws of



electrical attraction and repulsion were perhaps the principal facts known before the beginning of the present century. It is remarkable that the frictional electric machines of that time were essentially the same as ours; though we have now much more perfect apparatus producing the same kind of electricity, and founded on induction. As the type of these induction machines may be mentioned the well known Holtz machine. The house of Queen and Company, of Philadelphia, have several of these instruments in their fine exhibit. Two of them are of Toepler's modification, one having two very large plates, the other, four, and somewhat smaller. These two last mentioned are among the very best of their kind. Among the frictional and induction machines we might include here the hydro-electric machines. These are, in fact, frictional machines. They produce electricity by the friction of water-bubbles carried on with steam, and rubbing against the tubes through which they pass. All apparatus of this kind generate what is generally termed *statical* electricity. Electricity produced in this way is called *statical* or at rest, as opposed to *dynamical* electricity, or electricity in motion, because while in the latter we consider a continuous flow of electricity, in the former we regard especially the phenomena which take place when the agent is at rest. Statical electricity is often called *frictional* electricity with reference to the method of its generation; though heat or cleavage produce it as well. For some years back this kind of electricity has not attracted the attention of practical scientists to any great extent. The very small quantity in which it is necessarily gathered renders the usefulness of its effects comparatively trifling; while the tension it exerts makes its control and management a matter of great difficulty. Hence, with the exception of its employment for the firing of mines and lighting of gas—ends which could be attained as easily by other means—its applications to the uses of practical life are extremely limited. Its importance, however, is not to be measured by this standard. The form of electrical energy generated by friction puts before us a number of phenomena not to be observed elsewhere. It helps us to have a clearer notion of atmospheric electricity, a fact of the highest importance in these days, when so much study is devoted to meteorological science. The instruments which belong to atmospheric electricity must be classified by themselves, and we shall have something to say on this very important subject. Under this head, too, allusion must be made to the induction coils. Though depending for their action on a different source, they produce, nevertheless, the same kind of phenomena. This source is electro dynamical induction, about which a word in its own place.

Messrs. Queen and Company, of whose exhibit mention has

already been made, have several of these instruments in their collection. The large and powerful Ruhmkorff coil shown in this set is the work of Carpentier. These instruments form the connecting link between statical and dynamical electricity; the latter being had in what is usually termed the electric or voltaic current. These two kinds do not in reality differ, however unlike they may seem to be, either in the manner of their production, or in the phenomena they present. At present no doubt exists as to their essential identity. Dynamical or galvanic electricity was discovered only towards the beginning of this century; for although some of its effects were known at a much earlier period, they were attributed to statical electricity. We need not repeat the oft-told story of how Galvani came to its discovery, after a series of experiments on the muscular action of recently killed animals. What Galvani really discovered was animal electricity, an agent which certainly exists, but which must be counted as a mere nothing in comparison with dynamical electricity produced by other causes. After this came the famous controversy as to the origin of dynamical electricity, in which Volta and his contemporaries took so prominent a part. The dispute waxed hot. Some were for the contact theory; others for the theory of chemical action. And so the question has come down to our own times. That it is necessary to have recourse to chemical action in order to have an electric current of great quantity is plain from experience; yet after the experiments made by the defenders of the contact theory from Volta to Sir William Thomson, it seems undoubted that simple contact of heterogeneous substances produces an electric current. We may be allowed to hazard an opinion on the subject. It is another instance of the knights and the shield. There is truth on both sides; and the two theories in reality agree at bottom. Contact produces electricity, but only in small quantity, when the contact is simple. In order to have a large quantity of electric energy we must have a very intimate contact, and one which is rapidly renewed. Now this is had only in chemical action.

To proceed with order, we shall follow the classification of the programme. The second class of the first section has reference to the production of electricity, and is devoted to the exhibits of batteries, which constitute the source of voltaic currents. Their number is almost legion, and the number of accessories to these batteries is quite as large. This great variety of apparatus arises from the diversity of the objects aimed at in their construction. Sometimes constancy and uniformity in the current is desired; sometimes great strength or electro-motive force. In some simplicity is the thing intended; in others cheapness; and so on almost *ad infinitum*.

For a long time after the discoveries of Galvani, Volta, and their contemporaries, no great headway was made in electrical science, though applications of it to various purposes were by no means wanting. Thus, about the year 1800, Nicholson and Carlisle decomposed water by means of electricity, founding thereby the science of electro-chemistry. Davy advanced a step further, and in 1807 decomposed the alkalies. It was about this time, also, that he succeeded, by the use of a strong battery, in producing the electric light, since become so common. Until the invention of dynamo machines this light was an affair of so much trouble and expense that its universal introduction was practically impossible. Among other discoveries of this period must be mentioned that of thermo-electricity, or the production of electric currents by means of heat. The apparatus for this purpose belong to Class 3d of the present section. The currents thus generated by heat are very feeble, though they are remarkable for their constancy. This tends to make them available for many purposes in which great strength is not required. They also furnish us with the best means of ascertaining varieties in temperature, even at a distance. The application of this fact to the thermo-multiplier has helped Melloni, Tyndall, and others to arrive at some very remarkable results in the study of radiant heat. But, as we have said before, no progress worthy of the name was accomplished in electrical knowledge until 1818; when Oersted discovered the action of the current on a magnetic needle. This was the beginning of a new era. It was the first step in that series of experiments, which was soon to lead scientists to the knowledge of electro-magnetism. Indeed, it was not long after Oersted's discovery that Ampère, in France, took up the subject and established by experiments, as simple as they were ingenious, the laws of electro-dynamics. The work of Faraday served to confirm these results, and, together with that of Oersted, Ampère, and others, established the true theory of magnetism. That theory was the one proposed by Ampère. As the steps by which this eminent scientist arrived at his conclusions are generally known, and the theory itself fully confirmed by all modern discoveries, we shall confine ourselves to a bare statement of what it lays down. In magnetic substances such as iron, steel, and the like, every molecule, Ampère tells us, is surrounded by an electric current. These various currents move in different planes, but are capable of rotation around the molecules as centres. Now, one electric current, as experiment shows, exerts an attractive force on another, when the two are parallel in direction and flow towards the same quarter; the force is repulsive, if the currents, though parallel, flow in opposite directions. Hence it follows that the collective action of the molecular currents on any



outside substance must be null and void, so long as these currents remain in their diverse planes; because the action of each one will be neutralized by some other of a contrary direction. The magnetization of such a substance consists in giving to all these currents such a position that they will be parallel, and flow in the same direction, so that their energies will be combined. The best means of rendering these molecular currents homogeneous is an electric current passing in a coil of insulated wire around the bar to be magnetized. When such a magnetic substance as steel has great coercive force, the currents remain parallel, and we have a permanent magnet. Temporary magnets consisting of a bar of soft iron surrounded by a coil of wire are called electro-magnets, and, it is claimed, were first used by our own Professor Henry, the organizer of the Smithsonian Institution.

This in brief is Ampère's theory of magnetism, and it is accepted as undoubted by the majority of scientific men to-day. It is evident that this hypothesis, confirmed as it is by facts, establishes a very close relation between magnetism and electricity, and, in fact, reduces magnetism to the position of a subordinate class of electric phenomena. Following upon Ampère's work, as we have said, came Faraday's splendid discovery of dynamic induction. He found that when a wire in which a current passes constantly and uniformly is near another wire whose ends are joined together, no effect is produced in the second wire. But if the current in the first wire either begins or ceases, if it even increases or diminishes in strength, a current of short duration is set up in the second wire. The same phenomenon is noticed when a coil through which a constant current travels is brought near to or removed from the wire. In both cases the currents are known as electro-dynamical induction currents. They are called magneto-electric, if instead of the coil a magnet is used. (The magnet in Ampère's theory is comparable to a coil.) As it is by means of induction currents that most of the modern appliances of electricity are worked, one can understand the importance of their explanation. What we have said thus far will help us to understand the principles involved in the construction of magneto-electric and electro-dynamic machines. The number of electro-magnetic apparatus exhibited is quite large. As the instrument known as the Clarke machine may be considered as the type on which machines of this sort are constructed, it will not be out of place to give some idea of its nature and mode of working here. In this instrument a pair of bobbins of insulated wire with soft iron cores—true electro-magnets—are made to revolve rapidly before a magnetic battery, or set of strong magnets. Now, in a complete revolution each of these bobbins is brought under the influence of the magnets twice, and is as often removed from

them. Hence, four instantaneous induction currents are successively produced in each bobbin. These, however, so coalesce as to form only two distinct and successive currents for each revolution. The bobbins also are wound in such a manner that their currents coincide in direction, and so are added together. The currents thus rapidly reproduced flow in opposite directions, or are, as it is called, alternately positive and negative. When this does not interfere with the effects to be produced, they can be kept as such, that is, as alternating currents; or, they can be rectified by a commutator, if currents flowing continuously in the same direction be the thing required. Progress in science has helped inventors to simplify or increase the power of such apparatus. It was in this way that the Siemens armature and the Gramme ring originated. In several modern machines the armature and ring replace the bobbin with advantage, though the action of induction is essentially the same as in Clarke's apparatus.

As mentioned before, with the magneto-electric machines ought to be classified the dynamos or large machines, similar to the former, in which the inducing agent, instead of being a permanent magnet, is an electro-magnet, which can be made much stronger than the best permanent magnets. These machines, on account of the great electro-dynamic repulsion to be overcome, require great motive power, usually furnished either by steam or gas, or, where it is available, by water. It is by steam or gas that those at the exhibition are moved. In the dynamos, as well as in the magneto-electric machines, mechanical work is transformed into electricity. The great power required to move the dynamo produces, as might be expected, greater effects, giving us the enormous currents we are now grown familiar with in these machines. From what we have already laid down, it will be seen that in the dynamo we must consider the inductor, or electro-magnet, known as the field-magnet, and the armature which serves to receive the influence of the first, and is, essentially, the same as the bobbins in the Clarke instrument. According to the differences of the various dynamos in these two essential parts, as also in their commutators, we divide them into classes. Thus, with regard to the field-magnet, we distinguish those which are excited by the current of another machine entirely distinct from the armature, those in which the undivided current produced in the armature magnetizes the field before being utilized, and lastly, those in which the field is excited by this same current, but divided or *shunted*, as it is technically called; that is to say, by means of a suitable resistance coil the current produced in the armature is divided, one part passing around the field-magnet, while the other goes to the line. All dynamos are reduced to some one of these classes. Some can be used with

either arrangement. Many of them, as the Gramme, Brush, Thompson-Houston, Weston, and others, belong to the second class, though they could be used as those of the first or third are. Mr. Edison's incandescent light dynamo belongs to the third. It would be difficult to discuss all the dynamos now in use. Their number is necessarily very great, because they differ not only, as just said, in the mode of magnetizing the field, but also, and especially, in their armatures and commutators, as well as in a different combination of both of these elements or in other details, some of them very important. Thus, for example, some of them have the contact-brushes or receivers of the commutator movable, allowing different arrangements which produce currents of different intensity. To this class belong the Maxim and the Thompson-Houston dynamos, the latter having an automatic regulator very useful in practice, when one or more lights are cut off from a multiple circuit. This, with many other details, too many to be enumerated here, make this machine one of the best in use. The Unipolar or Ball's dynamo has the advantage of being light in weight, while it is, at the same time, very powerful. Nearly every inventor claims some special advantage for his machine; and the duty of examining them will devolve upon the appointed committee. It would be useless to enter into a more detailed account of the dynamos, the method of producing the current being fundamentally the same as that of the magneto-electric apparatus. We shall merely observe that of those we saw at work during the first days of the exhibition, all were of American make, and none producing alternating currents, similar to those used in England and France in connection with Jablochkoff candles.

Section the second, devoted to Electrical Conductors, must be passed over with a bare mention. For practical electricians and the manufacturers of electric supplies it may be a division of some importance; but to the casual visitor, while it affords him a great many proofs of the skill and ingenuity of the inventors, it gives no idea of theoretical progress. There are, however, a few exhibits in this section which merit our attention. We might mention the newly invented telegraphic conductor, consisting of a steel wire which has been coppered. The conducting power of copper is thus combined with the great tensile strength of steel. This is not the only advantage; for, as the compound wire has a considerably smaller surface than would be exposed in an iron wire of equal conducting power, the loss due to electro-statical induction is in great measure remedied.

Following the order of classification, we now pass from electrical conductors to a consideration of the instruments for electrical measurements. In doing this, we notice how beautifully theory



and practice assist each other. Every applied science is a sort of collective result. Theory comes forward with its principles; application develops them. The scientist casts the seed to earth; the practical inventor watches over its growth, and in time collects the fruit; his own labor helping in its turn to the production of new theories. With reason, therefore, did the late Clerk Maxwell some eleven years ago write: "The important applications of electro-magnetism to telegraphy have reacted on pure science by giving a commercial value to accurate electrical measurements, and by affording to electricians the use of apparatus on a scale which greatly transcends that of an ordinary laboratory." So that we are able to say with Jenkins: "There exist now two sciences of electricity, that of the treatises on Physics, and that more or less known of the electricians." This section of measurements contains appliances of the second order and is divided into four classes. The first three regard measurements of dimensions, such as standards and gauges, measurements of speed, force and energy, as speed counters and dynamometers, and lastly, photometric measurements, for the purpose of examining the luminous power of different electric lights. These three classes include objects not having special reference to electricity. Many of them are very ingenious, and forcibly remind us how the new needs which science has created for us are forever stimulating the ingenuity of inventive minds.

The fourth class, which comprises instruments more properly classed as electrical, brings us back to our subject. Some of these apparatus are of American make, but the greater number of them have come from France, Germany and England. Among the English instruments in this division are many from the London house of Elliott.

Before recent industrial and theoretical developments, most, if not all, electric measurements were of the qualitative sort; that is to say, the existence of the currents could be detected, and their kind noted, but if their other elements were to be measured, it was done in a very general way, and only by comparison more or less accurate with some other current. On the laying of the first cable across the Atlantic, the necessity for more exact methods of measurement was made plain to English electricians. Their results have since been generalized so as to extend to land telegraphy and all other modern electrical appliances. The characteristic elements to be examined in a current are, above all, difference of potential, electro-motive force, intensity, and the resistance presented by the conductor. No better idea can be formed of these elements, than by comparing the electric current with water flowing through a pipe. If water flows, there must be a difference of level which generates pressure or force, and so puts the liquid in motion. In

the same way, whenever we have a current of electricity, there must be between the point from which it is coming and that to which it is going a difference of electrical condition, or *difference of potential*, often, but incorrectly, called *tension*, which generates the electro-motive force, or force putting the electricity in motion. Were such a difference not to exist, there would be no electro-motive force, and consequently no current; as, were there no difference of level in the water-pipe—to return to our comparison—no pressure would be produced, and the water would remain at rest. Let us continue the instance. When water flows in a pipe, we can consider the quantity or volume of water passing in a second, and the resistance that is had from friction or other causes. So, when a current passes, resistance is offered by the wire or conductor, and we must consider this resistance as well as the quantity of electricity passing in a second, or the intensity of the current. These characteristic elements of a current bear a certain relation to each other which may be expressed by the law deduced from mathematical considerations by the late Professor Ohm, and verified experimentally by Pouillet. This law, known as Ohm's law, may be stated as follows: *The intensity of a current in an electric circuit is in direct proportion to the electro-motive force and in inverse proportion to the resistance.* In order, then, to take exact electric measurements, we must measure the resistance, the electro-motive force, and the intensity; and when there is question of a condenser, or apparatus in which electricity is accumulated, the quantity must be taken into account also. To do all this, it is first necessary to fix upon certain units; and electricians have agreed upon what is termed a system of absolute electric and magnetic units. The word absolute, it should be observed, is here used only as opposed to relative, and does not imply at all that the measure is absolutely accurate. It means that the measurements, instead of being simple comparisons with an arbitrary quantity of the same kind to be measured, are referred to the fundamental units of time, space, and mass. Let us make a comparison. To measure a force in horse-power is a relative measurement; to do so in foot-pounds, or the force which is capable of raising one pound through one foot, is an absolute one. In the same way, to say that a boiler has a pressure of five atmospheres is to express the measurement of its force relatively; but to say that it has a pressure of seventy-five pounds to the square inch, would be to give the estimate in absolute units. It is evident that relative measurements can be changed into absolute; but they are not expressed in the same way.

In 1863, the British Association appointed a committee composed of the most eminent electricians of Great Britain, to fix upon a standard of electric measurements. After eight years of work, this

commission published a very detailed report, and adopted a system of units founded on the centimetre, gramme, and second, as fundamental units of space, mass, and time. As a notice of the deliberations of this committee would be far too long and of too intricate and technical a nature to be given here, we shall content ourselves with a passing allusion to their results; observing that they are at present generally adopted, and have come into use since the last two Electrical Congresses of 1881 and 1884. They are known as British Association Units, in contradistinction to the arbitrary units formerly adopted, which varied for different countries, and sometimes even in the same country. The names of these British Association Units are taken from those of well-known scientists. The Unit of Resistance is called the *Ohm*. As determined by the last Congress in Paris, in April, 1884, it is the resistance presented to the current of electricity by a column of pure mercury at 0° C., having a section of one square millimetre (0.0155 square inch), and a length of 106 centimetres (41.733 inch). This is very nearly the same as the Siemens unit, used by many before.

The Unit of Electro-motive Force is called the *Volt*, and is very nearly that of a Daniell cell, whose exact value is 1.079 Volts. When electro-motive force only is considered, the size of the cell need not be taken into account, as this affects merely the internal resistance.

Intensity is measured in *Ampères*, sometimes called *Webers*, though this name is now generally abandoned. An Ampère is the intensity of a current which will be produced by an electro-motive force of one Volt, through a resistance of one Ohm.

The Unit of Quantity is the *Coulomb*, and represents the quantity of electricity passing through a conductor in a second, when the current has an intensity of one Ampère.

Lastly, the *Farad* is the Unit of Capacity, and represents that of a Condenser which contains one Coulomb, when charged at the potential of one Volt.

After these remarks, tedious perhaps, but necessary to our purpose, one can easily understand the meaning of Ohmmeters, Voltmeters, Ampèremeters and Coulombmeters. Many of these instruments may be seen at the exhibition. They serve as practical means to make the desired measurements, and may be used even by persons not very well acquainted with their theory. They might be compared to ordinary gas or water meters, which serve at a single reading to gauge the amount of gas or water which has passed through them in a given time. For more scientific researches, however, or for measurements of very variable quantity, more delicate instruments are needed. These last are used as standards in the construction of the meters we have mentioned.



These, too, have their place in the exhibition. One that we noticed was the Resistance Coil with the Wheatstone bridge used for measuring great resistance where the column of mercury, alluded to above, would be practically impossible. For the electro-motive force, it is necessary to have standard cells. Many of these are shown in the same section, together with a great variety of galvanometers, which serve to register the intensity of currents. The principle of action of these last is very simple. Magnetic needles, as is well-known, are deviated by a current toward the east or west, according to the direction in which the current is moving. This fact is made use of in all ordinary galvanometers, the intensity being measured by the angle of deviation. Where a Sine or Tangent galvanometer is employed, this intensity is found to be proportional—as may be easily demonstrated—to the sine or tangent of the angle of deviation, as the case may be.

The largest and beyond all doubt the richest display of the exhibition, is that of the Applications of Electricity. As was said before, it is divided into two great sub-sections, according as the instruments require currents of low or high power. In the first sub-section are nineteen classes devoted to telegraphs, telephones, and every sort of apparatus for giving signals by electricity—fire-alarms, burglar-alarms, electric-clocks, and so on through the long list of possible applications. The number is bewildering. There are applications to dentistry and surgery, to the industries, as spinning and weaving, to mining and blasting, to warfare and to music, a heterogeneous list having nothing in common save that electricity has ministered to their wants. There are organs with bellows moved by electricity; and an electric-motor runs the printing-press of the *Electric World*. In the not very large display of exhibits made by the United States Navy, there is an ingenious contrivance for exploding torpedoes. As an offset to this rather murderous exhibit, there is a new and remarkable refractor of foreign invention known as the Mangin Projector, designed for the use of light-houses.

The second sub-section of the exhibits devoted to the applications of electricity, requiring strong currents, is divided into seven classes, and contains whatever instruments are connected with electric-lighting, whether by the arc or incandescent light, electro-metallurgy, storage batteries or accumulators, and electro-motors, those especially which are used to transmit power to a distance. In such a multitudinous display it would be impossible to do more than explain what is of recent invention. We shall omit, therefore, whatever is well known, and turn our attention to those machines only which it is important to understand.

Let us take up telegraphy. However diverse the many instru-

ments used in this branch of applied electricity may be, they depend, nevertheless, on the same principle of electro-magnetism pointed out before. The Morse telegraph is the one still most generally in use, although printing telegraphs have come to be quite common also. The advances which have been made in this department of electrical science are really very remarkable. There has been a growth not merely in the improvement of details, but in the nature of the system itself. Thus, for instance, we have the duplex and quadruplex telegraph now employed so largely in this country and in Europe; and lastly, and most wonderful of all, comes the latest development, known as the Delany Synchronous Multiplex System, which helps us to send as many as seventy-two different dispatches at the same time, over the same wire, and in either direction. This invention, which has been perfected only within the past few months, may be used with the ordinary Morse apparatus, using either six or twelve sending and recording instruments. To give any adequate notion of the system would entail a description which it would be impossible to fully take in without diagrams. We shall therefore be very general. This invention, like all great inventions, is not the product of any individual mind, though, perhaps, in this particular instance, the details that Mr. Delany has introduced are so numerous as to justify its being called the Delany System. As the inventor himself acknowledges, the device is founded on the Phonic Wheel of Poul la Cour of Copenhagen. It is extremely complicated in its arrangements; but the following remarks will give some idea of its nature. La Cour's wheel is a flat cylinder having a metallic brush at a point in its circumference, which, while revolving with the wheel with uniform motion, touches successively a number of metallic uprights placed under the revolving cylinder. By this arrangement the wheel is made to act as a commutator or switch for the electric current. Now let us conceive two such commutators, turning rapidly and in perfect unison, one at each end of the line. Suppose each brush to pass in succession over six of the metallic uprights, thereby making as many successive contacts, so that at the sending end of the line the current from the battery passes in succession through six instruments or keys during one revolution of the cylinder; while at the other end of the line, and during precisely the same interval, it passes through six receivers. Now, it is very clear that a signal sent by the first key will be recorded by the first receiver, one by the second key to the second receiver, and so on for the four others. If the signals are very short, a single passage of the brush over the corresponding contact point will send them entirely to the corresponding receiver at the other end of the line; if the signal, however, be long, two or three contacts will send but

one, because the action of the current on each instrument is the same as if it were continuous. The intermittent action of the current does not affect the relay at the receiving station, because, instead of the ordinary kind, polarized relays are used. These do not move except when the current is reversed. The use of pole-changers instead of simple make-and-break keys causes this reversal to take place at the end of the signal, whereas the current is not changed, but only interrupted so long as the signal is sending. These main principles of the Delany System are not peculiar to it. The distinguishing feature of the invention is the means by which the originator obtains perfect synchronism in the revolving commutators. This is done by the use of tuning-forks in unison, which serve to make and break the circuit at each oscillation, and when the forks are not in unison, by a system of correcting currents, which retard or accelerate one of the commutators as many as three times in a revolution, just as the commutator mentioned happens to be beyond or behind the other. This is accomplished by means of a contrivance so ingenious as to place Mr. Delany's invention among the most noteworthy of the day. When the ordinary Morse telegraph is to be used, the commutator can be divided into six parts, each connected with its instrument: in this case six operators can work as quickly as they like. If they are satisfied with the average speed of ordinary messages, then the commutator is divided into twelve parts, and twelve operators can work at as many instruments. With printing receivers, the number may be increased to eighteen, thirty-six, or seventy-two, the commutator, of course, being divided into as many parts. By this arrangement perfect secrecy of the dispatches may be had. The expense, too, of keeping up the line being very greatly diminished, the cost of dispatches may be lessened in proportion. The number of repeaters which may be used in Mr. Delany's invention is not limited, a remarkable advantage which enables the system to work at any distance. These are the main features of this new Multiplex System of telegraphy. Its importance can hardly be overrated; and it deservedly occupies a place of honor in the immediate neighborhood of the great fountain illuminated every night at the exhibition.

Want of space obliges us to pass over many interesting details in the contrivances of modern telegraphy. The telephonic systems too must be set aside for the same reason. Of these last, three only are exhibited. The explanation of this paucity is to be sought after, we suppose, in the many lawsuits which have lately taken place on this head, some of which are yet pending. The Photophone of Professor Bell is quite a wonderful thing, though not an invention of recent date. An adequate idea of the principle involved in its working cannot be given here. It will be enough to



say that its inventor has utilized light as a medium for the transmission of sound, and its reproduction by means of electricity in a telephone. The action of light on the rare chemical element known as Selenium is the fact which has served as the foundation of the discovery. As far as we have learned, no practical application of Professor Bell's invention has as yet been made. Its importance is altogether theoretical. Yet we have no doubt that the time is not far off when even this discovery will find its use in the everyday walks of life.

The principal exhibits of the second sub-section, consisting of apparatus requiring a source of electricity of high tension, are not less important than those we have already described. Attractive as is the display of electric lighting, it contains little that is new since the last exhibition. We have now grown so familiar with the arc-light in the streets of our great cities that its effects are too well known to justify a description of them here. Rival companies have done their utmost to make the best possible display of their respective exhibits; and it is a matter of regret to us that we cannot make more than a passing mention of many machines and instruments that certainly deserve a more careful consideration. The automatic regulator of the strength of currents in the Thompson-Houston system is one of these. All who are familiar with any of the great dynamos, the standard Gramme for example, know that the best effect is produced when the conducting brushes touch the ends of the coils midway between the poles of the electro-magnet or inducing field. Now, if we conceive the brush to be turned around and displaced one way or the other, the current will diminish. The automatic regulator in question is based precisely on this idea. When one or more lights are shut off from a circuit, or when by any cause the driving engine makes the dynamo revolve faster, the current tends to increase. An electro-magnet, however, introduced into the circuit, attracts a movable armature connected with the conducting brushes; the brushes are displaced by the action of the armature, and the current diminished, that is to say, it regains the lower intensity it had before. If a new lamp be introduced, or the speed of the dynamo be diminished, the electro-magnet will attract the armature less strongly, and allow a retractile spring to draw the brushes into such a position as to increase the current.

Great headway has certainly been made in the various methods of arc lighting; but with all our advances, we are yet far off from what is desired. The inventor that shall produce perfect steadiness in the light and remove the disagreeable hissing of the arc—a defect which has been greatly reduced but not altogether corrected—will leave very little to be improved on. That such a wished-for

consummation will be attained at no very distant day, there is every reason to suppose, when we are brought face to face with these wonders that the exhibition has called together.

In many respects the incandescent system of lighting is preferable to the arc system, especially when we take into account the constancy of the light and its method of distribution. This form of illumination is becoming daily more common. Steamers, public buildings, hotels, private dwellings are now lighted with the incandescent lamp. For purposes of this kind, as well as for the lighting of mines, its greater safety gives it so obvious and decided a superiority over gas, that one ought to apologize for alluding to it. The *Electric World*, for June 21st of this year, gives us some important information on this point. There are, it tells us, over one hundred steamers, among which are not a few great ocean vessels, that carry, all told, some eighteen thousand lamps; and the number of these vessels is daily increasing.

During the first days of the exhibition there was a great tower building under the direction of the Edison Company. It was proposed to surround the structure with over two thousand incandescent lamps of different colors. When completed, it surely must have formed one of the most attractive features of the whole display. There was a large dynamo prepared for the lamps, on which the good-humored public, evidently at a loss for any more expressive name, was pleased to bestow the appellation Jumbo.

Next in importance to the contrivances for electric lighting, among the exhibits of this section, we must class the storage batteries or electric accumulators. We regret, however, to say that but few were put on exhibition, and those mostly of foreign make; many of our own manufacturers having nothing at all to show in that line, at least during the early part of the exhibition. Some years ago, when Faure first introduced his modification of Planté's secondary battery—the storage battery, as it is now called,—great hopes were entertained of its success. These batteries do not themselves produce electricity, but merely serve to accumulate it; or rather, were we to speak more exactly, we would say that they only shut up or imprison, in the form of chemical energy, electricity, which may at any moment be set free again. They consist essentially of lead plates, covered over with red oxide of lead and immersed in dilute sulphuric acid. When a current is passed through them, a chemical change or decomposition takes place, which serves to absorb and store up energy, so efficiently, too, that it is possible to regain a very large percentage of the electricity used in bringing about the change. Many of the dynamos that are used for illuminating purposes are at rest during the day, and it was thought that the powerful currents which might be generated

by them during that time could be conducted into these electrical reservoirs, from which one could draw a steady supply at any time, day or night. Small batteries also would, by accumulation of their action, produce intense effect. Moreover, the numerous and constant sources of power furnished us by nature in waterfalls and rapidly running streams, could, with very little trouble, be made to turn our dynamos at all hours, and so by means of these power-condensers supply a useful, and in many ways available, working force during the day, and illumination at night.

These hopes, though realized in great part, have, however, not been entirely fulfilled, and many considerations, notably that of expense, have been found to interfere with their practical working in the manner at first proposed. Experiment has put beyond all doubt the principle of accumulation of energy, transformable into electricity; and we have reason to expect that the storage battery will be soon brought to such perfection as to carry out fully the idea of its inventor, and perhaps perform more than was intended. If these expectations be ever perfected in practice, then a new class of electrical appliances, already a partial success, will be brought much more before the public—we mean the electric motors on exhibition in this same section.

It is now about fifty years since electric motors were first thought of, and some such machines were made, rather crude and imperfect it is true, but really demonstrating the possibility of using electro-magnetism as a motive power. If we imagine a soft iron armature revolving in front of a series of electro-magnets, and suppose that, by means of a suitable switch, a current is allowed to pass successively into each electro-magnet while the armature is approaching it, and is cut off when the soft iron is directly opposite the poles, we shall have the fundamental idea of all electric motors. If a primary battery be employed to generate the motive power, these electric engines are practicable indeed, but rather too expensive. But if the storage battery ever attains what is expected, if it can enable us to utilize and concentrate power of natural or artificial origin, in the manner already hinted at, then will electric motors become far more useful than they are at present. The great variety of form in the many on exhibition is quite noticeable, but they all rest either on the principle above mentioned or on that of the dynamos. Those belonging to the latter class may be made very powerful, and can be advantageously used for the transmission of power to great distances. In fact, all dynamos that generate continuous currents, as the Gramme, the Siemens, the Thompson-Houston, etc., may be used for this purpose on the principle of reversibility, enunciated first by Carnot. Mechanical power is, we have seen, transformed by the dynamo into electricity,



and by the dynamo, too, electricity may be again converted into power. The immense advantage of this conversion and reconversion may readily be pictured without any flight of fancy. Innumerable water-falls and swift streams are to be found throughout the land, hiding in their onward rush almost incalculable force. At present, a very large proportion of this power is allowed to go to waste. These falls could be made to turn dynamos, and the electric current thus produced, being conducted to neighboring towns or even to great distances, could be utilized at night for illumination, and during the day to turn other dynamos, thus reproducing, for general purposes, a high percentage of the power expended. Thus we have transported the effect of the water-fall, and lost very little on the journey; from the experiments recently made in France, fully eighty per cent. of the original power was carried to a distance of ten miles. The practical application of this method is evident to every one, and may in time receive greater encouragement. Some utilitarians have even proposed to transmit, in this way, to New York the twenty millions horse-power that now goes to waste at Niagara Falls. But besides the fact that such an attempt would mar the beauty of that wonderful cataract, it would hardly be practicable on account of the great distance and expense.

We must now pass to the department of Terrestrial Physics. This is a subject of the highest importance, for it is intimately connected with Meteorology, which is at present attracting so much attention in the scientific world. An intelligent following of Meteorology in its rapid advance requires in the student as accurate a knowledge as possible of atmospheric electricity; because to this are directly due most luminous atmospheric phenomena, as the lightning, the aurora borealis, etc. Indirectly, also, it is connected with nearly all the other events that tend to disturb the peace of our airy envelope. And so it is highly probable that, when this study becomes more developed, electrical observations will predict for us the motion of storms and will perhaps supplant the barometer as a quicker and more delicate indicator of approaching weather changes. Many of the instruments used in the examination of atmospheric electricity are on exhibition in different parts of the building, though they all belong to the same section. To enter, however, upon a discussion of the principles, or to describe the intricate detail of this class of apparatus, would be of interest only to experts. Together with these instruments that enable us to get at and examine the electric fluid as found in the atmosphere, we have others to ward it off from ourselves and our more or less destructible buildings. These lightning-rods, or "deductors," if we may so call them, are nothing but modifications of the old rod of Franklin. In connection with this section, we

must not forget to mention the beautiful display made by the Weather Signal Service Corps, for to that efficient body is due the merit of having brought about the great progress made by Meteorology in this country during these past years.

Next, in the same section, come the apparatus for the observation of Terrestrial Magnetism. In the many instruments of this class shown to the public, there are no new features; but at present, especially with the aid of Photography, they are of the greatest utility in exploring the vast field of terrestrial magnetism, which, as Maxwell truly says, "is as profound as it is extensive." It is a department of science as yet almost entirely unexplored; and the little we actually do know forces us to acknowledge, to borrow Maxwell's words again, "that we are yet unacquainted with one of the most powerful agents in nature."

We shall not stop to consider in detail the various historical, educational, and bibliographical exhibits, to be seen near the lecture room of the exhibition. It will be enough to remark that the display shows us how wonderful are the results that have thus far been attained, and how great are those that may be looked for in the future. It ought to be a matter of congratulation to all who are really anxious for the true welfare of the physical sciences, and who feel that they have nothing to lose, but rather everything to gain, in the light that researches will shed upon the ways of life, that electricity is, taught not in technical schools only—which, by the way, are by no means as widespread as electricians would like to see them—but in the ordinary educational institutions scattered up and down through the land. This inspires us with the hope that in future no one will be found altogether ignorant of this growing branch of science.

Incomplete as this paper of ours must seem to be, it has already gone beyond the limits we proposed to ourselves in the beginning. Before closing, however, we may be allowed to add a few words. It may be asked—Is the nature of this powerful physical agent known? Do study and the facts elicited by so many new applications give us any idea of its intrinsic nature? Whatever advances electrical science has made up to these times, it is not yet so well known, that we may answer the query with certainty. We have, it is true, a much better insight into its nature than the pioneers that have gone before us had. But, as was pointed out in the able paper read before the American Association for the Advancement of Science by the Vice-President of the Section of Physics, our knowledge is far from satisfactory.

Not many years ago, physicists were accustomed to speak of four imponderable agents. It was thought that four different fluids produced the phenomena known as heat, light, electricity and mag-

netism. It is held now that they are all only modifications of the same one agent to which the name of *ether* has been given, merely, as the late President Spottiswoode of the Royal Society said, "for want of a better name." Recent advances in the study of the phenomena of heat and light, especially in those known as *interference* and *polarization*, have led scientists to conclude that these apparently diverse agents are really due to vibrations of the ether, performed in planes perpendicular to that of their propagation. The difference in the number of these vibrations constitutes the difference between heat and light. As was said before, electricity and magnetism, according to the theory proposed by Ampère, are also two different forms of the same one agent. Now, a comparison of these four classes of phenomena, and of their several relations to each other, shown, for instance, in the rotation, by the electric current, of the plane of polarization of light, and especially in the transformation of energy, justifies the conclusion that it is the same agent which, by its various modifications, produces the phenomena of heat, light, electricity and magnetism. The first two are produced by vibratory motions. Can the same be said of the other two? There are some physicists who contend that electrical and magnetic phenomena are to be attributed to a transference of the fluid ether itself. Others again—and we are inclined to follow their opinion, though want of space prevents us from giving our reasons for so doing—hold that electrical phenomena are due to vibratory motion. Clerk Maxwell has shown that, in this view of the theory, the vibrations of electricity and magnetism may be conceived as taking place at right angles with those of heat and light; being thus perfectly comparable to the vibrations of sound.

And this brings us to the end. We have endeavored to give some idea of the progress made in electrical science, especially during our own times, in order that our readers may appreciate the value of such an exhibition as is now holding at Philadelphia. It is good to stop and look back now and then, especially when the course passed over is such that the difficulties mastered in it are so many pledges of greater triumphs yet to follow. The Philadelphia exhibition enables us to do this. It shows us how much has been done in the past; how much we may hope for in the future. It helps us to realize how mighty a harvest may be reaped from a handful of seed, when there are faithful husbandmen ever near to watch over the growth. What results time will bring about, we know not; but surely, with the marvels of the Philadelphia exhibition before us, we may look up to God and allow our hearts to be filled with unspeakable hope.



## BOOK NOTICES.

THE WORKS OF ORESTES A. BROWNSON. Collected and Arranged by *Henry F. Brownson*. Volumes X., XI., XII., XIII. Detroit: Thorndike Nourse, Publisher. 1884.

We are glad to see the rapid progress made by the editor and publisher of the works of Dr. Brownson, in issuing successive volumes of them from the press. They will form, when the series shall have been finished, one of the most complete collections of essays on questions of metaphysics, history, social and political philosophy, we know of in the English language. To the Christian controvertist and the student desirous of mastering principles which go to the heart of subjects which have been discussed with utmost earnestness, and will continue so to be as long as mankind continues to exist, the work will be of very great value.

The first of the volumes before us (Vol. X.) contains the first part of Dr. Brownson's writings on Christianity and Heathenism in Politics and Society. Some of the essays in this volume are on subjects of general and permanent interest, such as Catholicity Necessary to Sustain Popular Liberty, Labor and Association, Authority and Liberty, Civil and Religious Toleration, Paganism in Education, Liberalism and Socialism, Protestantism and Government, Christianity and Heathenism. Others are on local and transient topics, so far as regards their immediate occasions; such as Native Americanism, Ventura's Funeral Oration, Channing on Social Reform, Willitoft on Protestant Persecution, the *Edinburgh Review* on Ultramontane Doubts. These last-named subjects are discussed with constant reference to the principles which underlie them and which perpetually are more or less active.

Volume XI. contains the second part of Brownson's writings on Christianity and Heathenism in Politics and Society and are chiefly directed against Gallicanism and political Atheism. These are as pertinent in their exposure of the dominant spirit and tendencies of the age as they were when first written. Among these are Temporal and Spiritual, The Spiritual not for the Temporal, The Spiritual Order Supreme, The Temporal Power of the Pope, Mission of America, etc.

The essays on The Papacy and the Supremacy of the Spiritual Order, on The Normal Relations of the Church and the State, and on The Power Exercised by the Popes over Temporal Sovereigns during the Middle Ages were not, at the time of their first publication, received with universal favor by the Hierarchy and Clergy of the Church in this country. By some they were strongly opposed, not as unorthodox, but as inopportune and imprudent, and likely to expose the Church to unnecessary odium. But now, since the publication of the Encyclical of Pius IX., and of the Syllabus of December 8th, 1864, and the Acts and Decrees of the Holy Council of the Vatican, these objections have no force. Dr. Brownson's object in writing these papers, which are specially addressed to Catholics, was to check the liberalism and latitudinarianism which he saw were spreading among them. This, he thought, was of far more importance at the time than to direct his efforts chiefly to the conversion of non-Catholics. The idea that there ought to be, or could be, a separation of Church and State, he held was

political Atheism. In other words, it was equivalent to assuming that the political order is independent of the law of God ; that God is not sovereign in the State, and that for the State there is no God. To meet these pernicious errors, Dr. Brownson asserted the supremacy of the spiritual order ; that is, the sovereignty of God, and of the Pope as the representative of the spiritual order.

Subsequently, however, after the removal of Brownson's *Quarterly Review* to New York, in 1855, Dr. Brownson was led to change its tone and policy, though not its principles or doctrines. Highly esteemed friends urged him to make his *Review* auxiliary to a special movement, which they contemplated for the conversion of non-Catholic Americans. He had done, it was argued, nearly all that he could do in opposition to Liberalism, Socialism, and political Atheism ; now it was important for him to labor to convince and convert non-Catholics. Dr. Brownson accepted the urgent invitation. He labored to present the Church in a light that would be as little offensive to the prejudices of non-Catholics as he could without sacrificing orthodoxy. In doing this "he was obliged to confine himself to what was strictly of faith ; to insist on nothing that had not been formally defined to be *de fide*, and to content himself with presenting the minimum instead of the maximum of Catholic doctrine"—the very opposite of the course he had previously pursued. Thus "he fell insensibly into the poor policy of exhibiting Catholicity in its weakness, instead of its strength"—a policy he had previously rejected and ridiculed.

This lost Dr. Brownson, to a great extent, the confidence of the Catholic public, and not a few entertained the belief that he was on the point of returning to Protestantism or infidelity. "The attempt to make the *Review* the organ of a movement for the conversion of the country to the Church by converting the Church to the country" did not succeed, as the movement itself could not. The *Review* was suspended in October, 1864.

Very soon Dr. Brownson clearly realized his mistake. It was a mistake of policy, not of belief ; a mistake in the manner in which, for a time, he presented Catholic doctrine, but not as to its substance. Though the decrees of the Vatican Council had not then been formulated and even the Syllabus had not then been published, Dr. Brownson held and never ceased to hold as true the doctrines they subsequently enunciated.

Dr. Brownson was not at any time "a minimiser." He clearly understood and was firmly convinced that there are many things which have never been defined that no one is at liberty to deny ; that in fact nothing is judicially defined, till it has been controverted. He strenuously maintained this against Cardinal Newman's theory of the development of Christian doctrine, which assumes that nothing is of faith till it is defined. Brownson ever held and maintained that the definition does not make the faith, but in reality only explicitly opposes the faith to the error that contradicts it.

After a few years suspension his *Review* was revived, and the successive numbers that appeared, until failing sight and strength compelled its permanent closing, furnish incontestable evidence that his faith had never wavered, and that it was clear and firm on points respecting which many other Catholics were undecided until the decrees of the Vatican Council authoritatively removed all room for question or doubt. In June, 1872, he wrote : "Whatever else I may be, I am not a Liberal Catholic, but heartily accept the Syllabus and the decrees of the Vatican. . . . I am content with the Church as she is. I came to the

Church in 1844, in order to be liberated from my bondage to Satan and to save my soul. It was not so much my intellectual wants as the need of moral help, of the spiritual assistance of divine grace, in recovering moral purity and integrity of life, that led me to her door to beg admission into her communion. I came not to reform her, but that she might reform me. If I have even for a moment seemed to forget this, it has been unconsciously, and I ask pardon of God and man."

Volume XII. contains the third part of Dr. Brownson's writings on Christianity and Heathenism in Politics and in Society. The importance of the particular topics ably and lucidly discussed in this volume, as well as their direct bearing upon living, burning questions of to-day, will appear from their titles, some of which are :

The Church and the Republic, or The Church Necessary to the Republic, and the Republic Compatible with the Church : Christianity and the Church Identical ; The Church an organism ; The Day-Star of Freedom ; The Church and Modern Civilization ; Present Catholic Dangers ; The English Schism ; Père Felix on Progress ; Public and Parochial Schools ; Christianity or Gentilism ; Manahan's Triumph of the Church ; Christian Politics ; The Papal Power ; Rights of the Temporal ; Separation of Church and State ; Pope and Emperor ; The Reunion of all Christians ; Catholic Education ; and Three Essays on the Reformation.

Volume XIII. contains the fourth and last part of Dr. Brownson's writings on Christianity and Heathenism in Politics and in Society. Its scope may be inferred from the titles of some of its leading articles :

Liberalism and the Church ; Independence of the Church ; The Church and Monarchy ; Union of State and Church ; The Bishops of Rome ; Future of Protestantism and Catholicity under the fourfold division of The Secular Spirit, National Wealth, Civil and Political Liberty, Religious Liberty ; The School Question ; The Secular not Supreme ; The Papacy and the Republic ; Whose is the Child ; Bismarck and the Church ; Papal Infallibility and Civil Allegiance ; Education and the Republic ; The Public School System ; The Family, Christian and Pagan ; Protestant Journalism.

The importance of these subjects is self-evident. They embrace in the principles which form their basis every question which to-day, and, we may add, in all time, is involved in the controversy between the world and the Church, between infidelity and faith, religion and irreligion. These questions are discussed by Dr. Brownson in an eminently practical way, and with direct reference to the immediate circumstances with which they were connected at the time he wrote. Yet these questions have changed so little in their form, and not at all in the issues they fundamentally involve, that his discussions of them are as fresh and pertinent to-day as when they were first published. In accordance, too, with the analytical character of Dr. Brownson's intellectual methods,—an inborn tendency confirmed by his habits of searching investigation—his discussions always refer directly to the fundamental principles involved in the subjects on which he writes, and incidental circumstances are only alluded to so far as they serve to elucidate those principles. This gives a permanent value to his papers, and will cause them to live and to be read with interest in aftertimes as well as to-day.

Whatever may be thought of Dr. Brownson's metaphysical theories, few men have had clearer ideas of the philosophy of history and of the real meaning and fundamental issues involved in the various and, as regards their outward aspect, changing conflicts, between the Church and



the world, the spirit of belief and unbelief, of rationalism and of faith, which seemingly present a series of dissolving views in the constant panorama which the march of ages presents. He recognizes in them all the common principle which unites them, and in virtue of which they are only variations in the strategy of the unceasing war which the synagogue of Satan carries on against the Church, of the opposition of the spirit of unbelief to that of faith, of absorbing love for this world against that of belief and hope in the blissful realities of the world beyond the grave, of the refusal to acknowledge the supremacy of the spiritual over the natural order of things.

Opening the volume now before us (the XIII., and last that we have received), and turning almost at random to Brownson's four articles on the "Future of Protestantism and Catholicity," and to his paper on "Döllinger and the Papacy," you find them going directly to the very heart of their respective subjects. Take the following as an instance of his keen analysis and power of logical statement :

"The affirmative propositions held by Protestants are simply fragments of Catholic truth taught and held fast in their integrity by the Church long ages before Luther and Calvin were born, and constitute no part of Protestantism. The Protestantism is all in the perversion, corruption, or denial of Catholic truth. There is nothing in it of its own but its negations and hatred of the Church, of her faith, her discipline, and her worship, to be continued, or that can be the subject of any predicate. Protestantism receives into its bosom one form of error as readily as another, and complete unbelief as the inchoate apostasy called heresy ; though we readily grant that the majority of Protestants are not, as yet, prepared to accept infidelity pure and simple, and many of them, we trust, are, in their intentions and dispositions, prepared to accept and obey the truth when made known to them, and may yet in God's gracious providence find their way into the Catholic communion and be saved."

"The 'Reformers,' or the fathers of the modern Protestant movement, did not give up Christianity or the Church. They thought they could reject the Papacy and the Sacerdotal Order, and still retain the Christian faith and the Christian Church. But they were not slow to discover that this was impracticable, and that, if they gave up the Papacy and the Sacerdotal Order, they must give up the Sacraments, save as unmeaning rites, infused grace, the merit of good works, the Church as a living organism, the whole mediatorial work of Christ in our actual regeneration, and fall back on immediatism, and deny all living or present mediation between God and man. Their successors have found out that an irresistible logic carries them further still, and requires them to reject all creeds and dogmas as superfluous, to resolve faith into confidence, and to rely solely on the immediate supernatural operations of the Spirit. There is but one step further, and you have reached the goal, that of resolving God himself into the human soul, or the identification of God with man and man with God ; and not a few have already taken it."

Take the following, too, from the article on "Döllinger and the Papacy" :

"The only conservative power in the Church—and I might say in society—is the Papacy. Reject the Papacy, the supremacy of Peter in his successors, make the Church simply episcopal, presbyterian, or congregational, and she inevitably becomes national, and splits up into a thousand and one conflicting sects. A church, really Catholic, is inconceivable without the Papacy, as was always believed by the Church

and defined by the Council of the Vatican. Without the Pope as the source and centre of authority, the Church, as the kingdom of God on earth, has and can have no unity, and without unity it can have no Catholicity. Catholicity cannot be produced by aggregation, any more than infinity can be obtained by the addition of numbers. Only that which is essentially One can be Catholic."

"The Papacy is, therefore, essential to the very conception of the Church as Catholic. It is as essential to the Church organism as the central cell, or organite, as physiologists say, to every living organism, in which all in the organism takes its rise, and from which it proceeds, or by which it is produced. The organite, or central cell, in all organisms, generates or produces the whole organism. It must, therefore, be living and energetic, and, of course, does not and cannot derive its life or energy from the organism, which cannot exist without it; it must derive both life and the *vis generatrix aliunde*. Hence the spontaneous generation, asserted by some scientists, or socialists rather, is impossible and absurd."

"The Church is defined by the blessed Apostle to be the body of Christ, and must be an organism, like every living body, not a simple organization or association of individuals. The Pope, as its central cell, organite, or germ, cannot, then, derive his life, his *vis generatrix*, from the Church organism, for, without him, that can no more exist than can the generated without the generator, or the creature without the creator. The Pope derives his Papal life or generative energy through the Holy Ghost from Christ, and by Him teaches and governs the Universal Church; he is, as Pope, vitally connected, through the Holy Ghost, with Christ Himself, and is His representative or Vicar through whom the life of Christ flows to all who are in communion with Him, and brings them into living union with Christ the Son, who is one in the unity of the Holy Ghost with God the Father."

"Among Catholics the Church always means the visible body of Christ, mystically, or, as we have said, vitally united to Him through the Holy Ghost in the Sacraments and communion with His Vicar, the spiritual father of all the faithful. The 'Old Catholics' cannot fall back on the invisible church of Protestants, without giving up all pretence of being Catholics at all, in any recognized sense of the term. . . . If the Lord founded His Church on Peter,—that is, the Papacy,—it follows necessarily that, if you take away the Papacy, you take from the Church her foundation, and consequently leave her to fall through."

To go back to a preceding part of this article, the following paragraph sets forth, with admirable clearness and conciseness, the logical consequence of the Protestant principle:

" . . . . . The generality of Protestants acknowledge a Catholic Church in words at least; but very few of them hold her *visible* unity and Catholicity, and most of them take refuge in the assertion of the *invisible* Catholic Church. They, in fact, recognize no church organism at all, and the visible churches they do recognize are simply aggregations or associations of individuals more or less numerous. They recognize no Church in communion with Christ, and deriving its life from Him and imparting it to its members. In their view, the Church, as such, is severed from Christ, and has no vital relation to Him, except through its members. It derives its life from the individuals associated, who must obtain their Christian life, if they have any, and give evidence of living it, before they can be aggregated to the society. Hence, their churches serve no purpose, count for nothing in the economy of grace, or Christian life and salvation; and, accordingly, we

find Protestants gradually, as they recede further and further from the Church of Rome, coming to the conclusion that union with the Church is not essential, and that one can live the Christian life, and be saved, outside of all church organizations as well as inside of them, a conclusion strictly logical from protestant principles.

"To deny the visibility of the Catholic Church is to deny our Lord has founded any church, or set up His kingdom on earth for the spiritual instruction, discipline, and government of men and nations. Catholic theologians distinguish, indeed, between the body of the Church and the soul of the Church, and maintain that only those who belong to the soul of the Church can be saved; but they do not maintain, so far as I am aware, that no one can belong to the soul, without belonging, *vel re, vel voto*, to the body of the Church. The soul of the Church is Christ Himself, and Christ cannot be distinct from Christ. The invisible Church is not a church that Christ founds or creates, but is Christ Himself, without a visible body, organs, or representative; that is, no church distinguishable from the incarnate Word himself." . . .

With regard to Papal infallibility, Dr. Brownson, from the same article from which we have been latterly quoting, thus summarily yet conclusively disposes of the chief objections to it:

"I have listened with what patience I could to the facts and arguments adduced to prove that the Pope has erred in matters of faith; but even the great Bossuet was obliged to confess that he could not prove that any pope had ever erred when speaking *ex cathedra* and defining a point of faith, or condemning an error opposed to it. The strongest case is that of Pope Honorius, in relation to the two wills and two operations in our Lord. That the Pope was negligent and failed to do his duty of crushing out the insurgent error at once with the authority of Peter, no one disputes; but that he did not fall into heresy, or err in doctrine, the learned Bishop Hefele fully concedes. The erudite historian of the Councils, who had no unwillingness to find that the Pope had erred—for he was an opponent, not an advocate, of Papal infallibility—winds up his long discussion of the question of Pope Honorius, by asserting that the Pope was orthodox; a conclusion I came to years ago, from the Pope's own letter to Sergius. Nobody pretends that the Pope is impeccable; but a moral fault is not necessarily a doctinal error, and it is only for a moral fault that Pope Leo II. confirms the censure of his predecessor."

With like conciseness and vigor Dr. Brownson disposes of the pretexts under which the secular powers of Europe opposed the definition and promulgation of the dogma of Papal infallibility:

"The pretence, that the definitions of the Council of the Vatican infringe on the rights of sovereigns and impair the obligations of existing concordats, is hardly worthy of serious consideration. They change nothing in the previously existing relations of the Church and State, or in the obligations of the concordats conceded by the Church to the State. The Pope acquires by them, in relation to the Church or the State, no new power, and no power he has not in all ages and nations claimed and exercised, or which has not been conceded by every sovereign State that has negotiated with him a concordat. The very fact of negotiating with him a concordat, recognizes him as Sovereign Pontiff or supreme governor of the universal or Catholic Church; and this is all that the Council has defined as to Papal supremacy. Whether the Church holds the Pope to be infallible or not in teaching the universal Church, is no concern of the State as such; for the State, in consideration of certain concessions to it by the Pope in the concordat,



guarantees her full liberty of doctrine and worship, and the State can take no cognizance of what she teaches her children. Infallible or not, a Papal constitution of doctrine has always been binding by every concordat on the State in its relation with Catholics or the Catholic Church ; and, in all cases where Catholic rights or duties were involved, is and always has been the supreme law for the civil courts. A Papal constitution could not be lawfully resisted before the definition, any more than it can be now. Dr. Döllinger knows this as well as we do, and he cannot have made his objection in good faith."

"The Papal infallibility assures nations, governments, and individuals that the Pope can declare nothing to be the word of God which is not His word, or to be the law of God which is not His law ; and no one has ever had the right to disbelieve the word of God, or to disobey the law of God, as declared by the Pope. The definition, therefore, imposes upon men or nations no new obligation of faith or obedience, and the Papal infallibility offers the very guaranty that all men and nations want ; that nothing but the infallible word of God shall be proposed to the faith of either in morals or practice not enjoined by the divine law infallibly applied. . . . Almighty God could give, confer no greater boon on the human race than in the institution of a living and visible organ of such infallibility, accessible to all the world. The infallible Pope is in the spiritual firmament what the sun is to the material, and gives light, life, and warmth, and health to all on whom he sheds his radiance. The great difficulty men have in believing it, is that it seems too good to be true. But is there anything too good for Him to give us, who freely gave up His only begotten son to die for us ; or is there any good that the Son, who freely humbled Himself, took on Him the form of a servant, and for His love of us submitted to the death of the cross, and to Whom is given by His Father all power in heaven and on earth, will withhold from us ? Do we forget that the Gospel is the gospel of infinite goodness, love and mercy ?

"Infallibility in teaching is a necessity, if men would know or believe the truth. Without infallibility somewhere and practically available in believing, there can be no true belief or faith, human or divine ; for a belief that is not certain is simple opinion, and without infallibility there is no certainty. Hence all men, who hold that certainty in any thing is attainable, assert infallibility."

Thus, ably and eloquently, and with irrefutable logic, did Dr. Brownson advocate and defend the supremacy of the Pope and the infallibility of his *ex cathedra* teaching, both before and after the decrees of the Vatican Council. In the course of his long life, and not only when he was a Protestant and a rationalist but afterwards, Dr. Brownson made mistakes, as who has not ? But to his praise be it said, he was ever submissive to authority, and when brought to the perception of his mistakes, no one could be swifter to frankly confess them, and energetically to labor to correct them and undo their consequences.

His works, when fully republished, will be a monument of his personal sincerity, whole-souled earnestness, learning, and eminent ability ; and those which were written after he became a Catholic are clear and striking instances of the power of the *Faith* in giving additional force and strength to human genius and knowledge. Dr. Brownson's writings before he became a Catholic showed his bright intellectual gifts, but the productions of his pen after he was received into the Church, have clearly and incontestably a power of reasoning, an elevation of thought and mastery over the subjects he discusses, which far transcend the

ability he previously displayed. We await with eager interest the subsequent volumes of his collected and republished writings.

---

LUTHER: An Historical Portrait. By *J. Verres, D.D.* London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society. 1884.

Of lives and sketches of Martin Luther, it might seem that already we have had quite enough. The recent celebrations of the fourth centenary of his birth by almost all sects of Protestants and free-thinkers produced a huge bulk of sermons, speeches, lectures, newspaper articles, pamphlets and books respecting him. In these his character and actions have been depicted with all the variety of perspective shading and coloring which ingenuity taxed to the utmost could devise, and yet all combining, so far as these pictures have been painted by non-Catholics, to make him out a hero of the highest type, a scholar, a sage and law-giver, a prophet and a soldier of Christ, of most exemplary life, profound prayerfulness, firm faith and undaunted courage; the regenerator of his age, and the father of modern civilization. His acknowledged weaknesses were represented as evidences of his robust strength, his faults as excellencies, and his vices as virtues. The coarseness and vulgarity, the passion and brutality and obscenity, which constantly come to view in his writings, were systematically suppressed, and detached sentences and paragraphs expressive of pious thought, were gathered and carefully put together, in order to furnish proofs of his virtuous and devout habit of life.

Thus, the old traditionary falsehood respecting Luther was perpetuated in the public mind, and the truth suppressed. This was all the more easily done, because the vulgarity, the profanity and obscenity of Luther's habitual utterances so thoroughly permeate most of his works, that, to publish a faithful translation of them in the English language is impossible, without subjecting both the translator and the publisher to condemnation by the law of the State, as well as by the law of common decency.

On the other hand, numerous other sketches and lives of Luther have been written and published by Catholic writers. These have brought out the truth respecting him, yet not the *whole* truth. For the reasons above referred to rendered this impossible. Still what they did bring to light, abundantly supported by undeniable historic proof, amply sufficed to show what manner of man Luther really was. But, as regards these writings, in judging of the objects they will subserve, it has to be said, and we say it with regret, that, in great degree, they fail to accomplish the object they are intended to accomplish. At most they subserve it only to a limited extent, and among those, too, who scarcely need to have their already correct though only general and perhaps indefinite ideas of Martin Luther confirmed. It is the fact, lamentable as it may be, that Protestants, and not only Protestants but non-Catholics, with few exceptions, do not and will not read a historic or religious work that is written from a Catholic point of view. The imprint of a Catholic publisher upon the title-page is sufficient to deter them from even glancing over the subsequent pages. And, even if the work be sent forth from a non-Catholic publishing house, by a subtle instinct, born of seemingly invincible prejudice, they immediately discover the spirit of the writer, and turn away from the book without reading it.

Then as regards Catholics, the multitude, the less highly educated and the only partially educated, on general principles regard, and it must be acknowledged rightly regard, the question as one that has been long

ago settled, and which they have no need to re-investigate. The conviction is fixed in their minds, that whatever may or may not be the details of Martin Luther's character and conduct, he was an arch-heretic, the founder of a schismatical sect, the propagator of pernicious heresies. If they want proofs of this they need not search history. They can find them in abundance, in the present condition of the sects which have sprung from him or his co-workers and from the errors they disseminated.

As for educated Catholics they are not excusable on the grounds we have mentioned. However strong may be their convictions with regard to the so-called Reformation, and the men who were the leaders of that satanic revolt against divine authority, both in Church and in State, they ought to employ their intellectual advantages in more thoroughly acquainting themselves with the historical, philosophical and theological reasons for their faith, and thus let the light which they possess shine forth for the convincing and confirming of others. But the fact is, a fact which cannot be too deeply deplored, that the vast majority of our educated Catholics purchase and read very few Catholic books. They turn away from Catholic literature, and give their attention and their leisure time to making themselves acquainted with what non-Catholic writers have to say on the various secular, literary or historical subjects of the day. Thus, while they become familiar with the ideas, hostile to their faith, which permeate the literature of the day, they are unarmed with specific answers to those ideas, and have no other defence against their pernicious influence than the general opposite convictions they have received and are unwilling to give up. They are powerless, too, in society to confute those erroneous ideas, and can only oppose them with arguments based on grounds which, however true in themselves, are unsatisfactory to their non-Catholic associates.

Before closing these general remarks we must add that there are other reasons why we think that exhibitions of the characters, inconsistencies, and flagitious lives of the so-called Reformers are, generally speaking, not calculated now to do much good. One of these reasons is that the public in general seems to care very little what their personal character really was. It looks upon them as exponents of a general movement towards free thinking. It attaches no importance to religious creeds, those either of the Reformers or of the Church. It believes in free thought, and to a very great extent in free living. All it really requires is such a regard for decency as throws a covering over indulgence in vice sufficient to hide its naked ugliness from public view.

Another and deeper reason is that Martin Luther and his fellow "Reformers" were not really the progenitors and fathers of that movement. It was not they that produced it. They were its representatives, its trumpets, its instrumentalities. It spoke through them. It used them for its own purposes. But they did not create it or produce it. It would have come if they had never lived. It had its roots and causes in a logical necessity. That necessity was not abuses in the Church. Abuses did exist, though their extent is commonly greatly exaggerated. The necessity we refer to was the logical necessity of false ideas and principles of error and sin and severance from God, working themselves out to their legitimate consequences. The peoples of Europe had been rescued by the Church from ignorance, and the social and civil confusion consequent upon the destruction of ancient pagan civilization, and the deluge of savage barbarism which poured down upon Europe from Scythia and Scandinavia. Ignorance, under her fostering care, had been supplanted by knowledge, political confusion and rudeness by social and civil order, poverty and misery by prosperity and wealth. Then en-



d a repetition of the old, old story so often recounted in the history of nations: "The beloved grew fat and kicked; he grew fat and thick and gross; he forsook God who made him, and departed from God, his Saviour." Secular rulers became conscious of their power, and their peoples proud of their prosperity. Both forgot to whom they owed what they possessed. Learning increased and with it came intellectual pride.

The classic literatures of pagan Greece and Rome were studied with idolatrous devotion, and pagan figures of speech, pagan allusions, fancies, and ideas permeated the literature of the age. Intellectual pride supplanted Christian faith and humility, and, in short, the civilization which the Church had created, contemptuously turned its back upon its own creator and promoter, and declared its independence of her.

It was a logical, a natural necessity of this spirit, this state of things, that princes and peoples alike should revolt against the spiritual authority of the Church, and that, it being denied and resisted, they should array themselves against each other, princes becoming arbitrary tyrants, and peoples becoming defiantly rebellious subjects. As regards literature, philosophy, theology and morality, the same logical necessity led to the contemptuous throwing overboard of Christian Scholastic philosophy, to the denial of the powers and functions of true reason, and the exaltation of arbitrary free-thinking in their stead. The revolt against authority, therefore, was identical in principle, though different in form, with that of the "Reign of Terror" in France. Luther was, in fact and truth, the precursor of Voltaire. Yet the one as little as the other was the creator of the movements which they have the infamous discredit of producing. They were their creatures, their satanic prophets and precursors, the exponents of the false principles and impious errors those movements embodied.

While, therefore, we deprecate the mistake of seeming to attach undue importance to Luther's character, actions and writings, by bringing them so prominently to notice, overpowering as is their testimony against the satanic movement misnamed "the Reformation," yet we make an exception in favor of the work before us. It is written by a scholar and a thinker; by one who has not skimmed superficially over Luther's life and writings and actions, but has examined them carefully and exhaustively. He is a master, too, in the art of compression, and knows how to go directly to the heart of subjects, omitting matters of secondary importance, and seizing upon and bringing to view those only which are of primary significance. He understands, too, how to be analytical without becoming technical, and philosophical without becoming abstruse and dry. Hence his treatise has the interest of a direct and continuous narrative, and yet the logicalness and thoroughness of an analytical, philosophical treatise. While it lacks the fulness, as regards the facts of Luther's actions and conduct, of Audin's *Life of Martin Luther*, it yet furnishes a clearer insight into his real personal character, the false principles by which he was actuated, his intensely wicked spirit, and the fundamental ideas and tendencies of his utterances and writings.

He does not bring out the worst of these, for regard for decency forbids. But what he does bring to view, and what in addition he suggests, confirmed by all sufficient proof, abundantly suffices to give the reader a true idea of who and what Martin Luther was and did.

The work is valuable, too, in another respect. It gives a more correct idea, supported with abundance of historic proof, of the real condition, the prosperous and comparatively happy condition, of the people in the sixteenth century; and of the fact that it was their prosperity,

their intelligence, their possession of civil rights and power that became a snare to them and their temporal rulers; and that seduced the people into revolt against authority on the one side, and the princes, on the other, into arbitrary tyranny and oppression.

CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION. By *Right Rev. Monsignor Capel, D.D.*, Domestic Prelate of His Holiness, Leo XIII., happily reigning, and Member of the Congregation of the Segnatura. New York: D. & J. Sadlier & Co. 1884.

CATHOLIC: An Essential and Exclusive Attribute of the True Church. By *Right Rev. Monsignor Capel, D.D.* New York: Wilcox & O'Donnell Co., and D. & J. Sadlier & Co. 1884.

The first-mentioned of these publications is an enlargement of a discourse by Right Rev. Monsignor Capel on "God's Conditions for Pardoning Sin," delivered in the Cathedral, at Philadelphia, and subsequently published at the request of many of his hearers.

In treating of his subject, the Right Rev. writer first shows the nature of mortal sin in putting us at enmity with God, and depriving us of all claim upon Him on any ground of justice. He then shows that pardon and forgiveness of mortal sin can only be obtained through the infinite mercy of God by fulfilling the conditions which God has imposed for reconciling the sinner to divine favor, and thus restoring him to his lost sonship.

One of these conditions flows from the infinite holiness of the divine nature, namely: contrition on the part of the sinner. "The other, which is judicial absolution from sin, implying previous confession of it, is imposed by the revealed law of God, and is, therefore, a divine command obliging all—Popes, Bishops, Priests, and people."

The true nature of contrition or repentance is thus concisely shown, and the distinction clearly made between sorrow and grief for sin, accompanied with a purpose of amendment, from purely human motives, and the true sorrow for sin, which alone is acceptable to God, and which springs from a supernatural motive, the soul being excited thereto by divine grace.

The Right Rev. writer then shows that for the purpose of enabling contrite sinners to obtain judicial absolution from sin, it has pleased God to institute a human and visible Ministry of Reconciliation. He shows that this Ministry of Reconciliation possesses judicial power; this being conclusively implied in the fact that to it is committed the authority of remitting or retaining sins. Also, that it is a primary condition of just judgment that the judge should not only be cognizant of the law which is to be administered, but also of the cause which is submitted for judgment. Applying this to the exercise of the judicial power with which the Apostles and their successors are invested, the writer shows that two things are needed: First, that they should know the law and the conditions on which sin is to be remitted or retained. This they can only learn of God. Second, that they should know the sin committed, its nature and its circumstances. But sin is in the soul. It is only the individual offender who can know the sins for which he seeks forgiveness, and the disclosure of them can only come from him. Confession, therefore, is the necessary and preliminary condition for seeking absolution from sin. Consequently, the honest, humble, contrite accusation of all deadly sins constitutes the essential character of such confession or avowal of transgressions.

The Right Rev. writer then shows that interior contrition is to be followed by the judicial sentence of a duly-appointed Priest, to whom

confession has been previously made, is the unanimous teaching of Christian writers from the earliest date. He proves this not only from citations from the Church Fathers, but also from heretical sects and schisms from the earliest ages up to modern times. Finally, he proves that the Sacrament of Penance is supported by the reason of things, and adduces numerous testimonies, unintended and unwilling, of Protestants and infidels in its favor.

The argument is concise yet clear, logical, and conclusive. The historic proofs cited in its support are gathered from very many sources, some of them not easily accessible in this country.

We have given so much space to the first-mentioned of Monsignor Capel's publications, that we must, with regret, dismiss the last and more comprehensive and important, with only a few words.

It deals with the general and all-important issue between the countless sects which contend to be Christian, and the Church—who is the lawful possessor of the title CATHOLIC.

This, in fact, is the real question with all who claim to be Christians, understanding what the claim actually involves. For that the Church which Christ founded was intended to be "Catholic" is an indisputable fact conceded by all, whether infidels, Protestants, or members of the Holy Roman Catholic Church. To the answer of the crucial question to whom and to what society or organization does the title CATHOLIC exclusively belong, Monsignor Capel devotes himself in the work of which we have already given the title.

The immediate occasion for writing it was a discussion in the last Convention of the "Protestant Episcopal Church." It was then and there proposed that the title of its "Book of Common Prayer" be changed by striking out the words "Protestant Episcopal" and inserting "Holy Catholic" in their stead. The proposal was rejected, and, whatever the convention consciously intended, it proved by its own action that it, and those it represented, had no claim to being regarded as "Catholics" either by themselves or others.

But the value of Monsignor Capel's work goes far beyond the special occasion which induced its preparation and publication. It is a complete resumé of the evidences, theological and historical, that the Holy Roman Apostolic Church, and it alone, has right to the title CATHOLIC. The argument is clear and conclusive, and the historical citations are as full as can be compressed into the compass of nearly one hundred and fifty octavo pages.

IRÈNE OF CORINTH; A Historical Romance of the First Century. By *Rev. P. J. Harrold*. Lewiston, New York: Index Publishing Company. 1884.

An interesting story, carrying the reader through many of the scenes, and reciting with substantial historic accuracy many of the events, of the times of Vespasian and Nero.

MAN A CREATIVE FIRST CAUSE Two discourses, delivered at Concord, Mass., by *Rowland G. Hazard, LL.D.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1883.

Mr. Hazard is an idealist of idealists. According to him, man lives in a universe of ideas of his own creation. Man's "constructing this universe within his own mind is the principal if not the sole end of life."









PERIODICAL

70742

**DOES NOT CIRCULATE**

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE  
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM



